A STUDY
OF THE VAKIF INSTITUTION IN
THE TRADITIONAL OTTOMAN CITY

by
Nurcan Kuleli
B.A. in City Planning, Middle East Technical University, 1981

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in
Social Sciences in partial fullfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Sociology

Boğaziçi University
1986

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is the vakıf institution within the context of the traditional Ottoman city. The elucidation of the role of the vakıf in the urban heritage of Republican Turkey is essential to an understanding of contemporary municipal institutions, their articulation and/or disarticulation with the urban community of the present. Thus the point of departure is a concern with how the present urban forms and institutions are shaped by the heritage of the past. The study itself is confined, however, to one specific institution which played a key role in the traditional Ottoman city-the vakıf.

The vakıf-pious foundation-is itself an institution that subsumes a wide diversity, not only among regions and historical periods but also, in the same region or city within a given period, it exhibited an almost unlimited variety of forms in terms of ownership, purpose, revenues, etc. Thus it may appear spurious and misleading to talk about 'the vakıf' institution in general. The study of the vakıf as a 'generic' institution may be criticized on the grounds that the very diversity of the phenomenon precludes generalizations. In pursuing a "generalizing science" a sociologist always lays himself open to outrage of the adherents of those disciplines in which the study of uniquness is central. But to quote from Max Weber,[x]

> "Sociological analysis both abstracts from reality and also helps us understand it", and consequently,
> "The abstract character of sociology is responsible for the fact that compared with actual historical reality, they (i.e. sociological concepts) are relatively lacking in fullness of concrete context."

Drawing upon the justification provided by Max Weber, I will in this study focus upon the vakıf as a "generic" institution.

---

[x]Weber, Max (1925); 'The Theory of Social and Economic Organization', Free Press, 1964, pp. 109-12.

a. Conceptual framework

The general, encompassing framework within which the vakıf institution is analyzed in this study is that of the 'Islamic City'. The theory of the Islamic city is related to the dichotomy between Oriental and Occidental cities posed by Western scholars. When Western scholars first sought to understand the nature of the Islamic cities, they began by comparing them with the city states of the classical Greece and Christian Europe. Islamic cities were organized on bases other than those of municipal autonomy and local self-goverment which were the characteristic features of their European counterpart; these features were those of the urban life in the West, but 'lacking' in the East. Thus the prevailing conceptualization of Islamic cities focuses upon the political institutions of the Ottoman order which serve to differentiate "city" from the "village".

To the extent that the emphasis has been upon the central state and religious ideology, Ottoman cities appear to lack in original urban institutions. From this point of view, while the state prevented the formation of any autonomous group outside the central sphere, religious ideology did not permit any legitimate group or corporation between the individual believer and the whole community of believers— I will define the vakıf, in the same framework, as an organizational base for the town people. Besides its political implications, the vakıf institution in its various categories will be formulated as an urban institution which had numerous influences on the urban social and economic life.

b. Avaliable sources and information on the vakıf

The vakıf institution is by no means an unexplored field of study. On the contrary, there is a wide range of detailed meterials and empirical data. The problem for the social science research however, stems from the fact that the raw information on thousands of vakfiye (registers in which the foundation date, the name of founder often the family name, the type of property dedicated, conveniently grouped land, buildings and mixed, the size of endowment, the number of beneficiaries, etc. are listed) a considerable number of which have already been translated from Ottoman to contemporary Turkish, is extremely difficult to process.

Another feature of available information is that nearly all of them evaluate the same dimensions of the subject. Despite the central importance of the vakıf in the analysis of traditional urban society, relatively few studies have been related to the social and economic ramifications of this institution. The majority of the present research in this field is devoted to religious and legal aspects of vakıfs, the principals of fikh on vakıf, the uncertainty in law regarding the question of ownership in the last century.

A second problem, in addition to magnitude of unprocessed, raw information, is the ideological controversy surrounding the vakıf institution in early decades of the Turkish Republic. This ideological controversy has tinged the evaluative literature on vakıf. Thus, on the one hand we find the vakıf institution being associated with the degeneration of classical Ottoman society. Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924), whose thoughts had been influencial on the Committee of Union and Progress and early Republican ideological milieu, is one of the leading opponents of the vakıfs. He criticized the autonomy of vakıf institution and labelled the vakıf as being the state within the state.

> "Bu divanda eğişmez bir hizmet
> Murakibi, bir ölünün pençesi ...
> Niçin bilmem, dirilerin verilmiş
> Dizginleri bir ölünün eline?
> Neden böyle bir dur emri verilmiş
> Yürümeyi seven bu Türk iline?
> Baba demiş: 'Oğlum satar bu malı;
> Vakf edeyim kalsın daim soyumda ...
> Çalışmasın soyumun hiçbir dalı
> Bu fikirden doğmuş bütün vakıflar
> Yapmış halkı tevekkülcü, kaderci
> Manastıra dönmüş bütün vakıflar
> Ki beklerler ahiretten haberci
> İslamiyet iğrenirken ruhbandan
> Vakıf ona rahipliği öğretmiş
> Harabeler mahrum kalmış umrandan
> İmaretler tembelliği üretmiş
> En azimli milleti bu bid'at
> Kılmış böyle iradesiz, kötürüm
> Bizi derviş yapan değil tarikat
> Ben tekkede mürşid vakıf görürüm." [xx]

[xx] A Ziya Gökalp's poem from 'Menşei ve Tarihi Gelişimi Açısından Vakıflar', Nazif Öztürk, Vak. Gen. Müd. p. 148

For Ziya Gökalp, Vakıf is like a dead body that controls the dynamic of life. The life style it brings about creates inertia, such that people choose fatalism. He points out the similarity of vakıfs and monastries, in which people wait for the coming of a command from the other vorld. In spite of the Islamic dislike of the cleargy, vakıfs teach people how to be a priest. To the extent that these ideological controversies form the background of much of what has been written on vakıf, it becomes difficult to seperate out the polemics from the evaluation in the existing literature.

c. Outline of the present study

The present study consists of four major chapters. The first chapter aims to provide a review of existent literature on the Islamic city in a historical perspective beginning from the Weber's theory. I'll focus on the concept of Islamic city in detail and investigate the validity of the formulations on the Islamic city from a comparative perspective. The second chapter consists of an overview of the methods of expansion and settlement used by the Ottomans and forms a general framework within which the social and political implications of the institution are examined. The internal dynamics of a pious endowment will be studied: the legal proces on foundation, its administration, the social position of administrators and founders...

In the third chapter, I delineate the urban functions of the vakıf institution in the organization and reproduction of urban life. The imarets as the service areas are characterized by the religious and educational activities. The questions arising from the various direct influences of the vakıf on economic process, especially on real estate market will be discussed. The vakıf construction activities might be one of the paths for the clarification of the spatial organization in the traditional Ottoman city.

The examination of vakıf history will bring a new standpoint to the social and economic history of İstanbul. In the last chapter, I have restricted my approach to a preliminary description of the vakıf foundation in the first stages of the development of the city as an Ottoman town.

I. THE ISLAMIC CITY

What I call the 'Islamic city' is not a unique urban character
which has taken the same form in all regions and periods but a kind of
ideal form to explain an urban society posited versus to the western city.
To question of the validity of such an approach which is based on a very
western view point and to review research on Islamic cities exceeds the
limits of this study, the formulation of the Islamic city in present
literature would make it necessary, at least unavaidable to assert the
ungratifying aspects of the theory. In this chapter, I will try to point
out the main themes of the approach and to comment that the study aimed to
analyse the traditional Islamic city must include the indigenous,
distinctive and original institutions of urban society.

The theory of Islamic city had taken its terminology from Weber's
theory of the city. The concept formulation in terms of which Weber
brought together and surpassed the various forms of the institutional
theory of the city current in his day was the theory of the urban community.
In contrast to the preceding theories which defined the city in a peculiar
order and historical primacy of its institution they took to be central
or original; Weber formulated the term of urban community with an order
of institutions. "To constitute a full urban community the settlement had
to represent a relative predominance of trade commercial relation with the
settlement as a whole displaying the following features: 1.a fortification,
2. a market, 3. a court of its own and at least partially autonomous
law, 4. a related form of association, and 5. at least partially autonomy
and autocephaly, thus also, an administration by authorities in the
election of whom the burgher participated. An urban community in the full
meaning of the word appears only in the Occident. Expections occasionally
were to be found in the Near East (in Syria, Phoenicia and Mesopotomia)
but only occasionally and in rudiments.[1]

---

[1]Max Weber, The city, p. 54-55

The second thought of Weber was supported by an idea that the city in Orient was a center of state administration. In other words, the existence of a state authority prevented cities becoming full urban communities. In occidental cities, the urban community enjoyed political autonomy and establishment of permenant urban garrisons composed of the cities own soldiers secured this autonomy else, at times pursued colonialist foreign policies. In city administration, problems respecting land owners, market regulations and trade, the city courts customerily employed an autonomous law with citizens as jurymen. Such legal establishments originating through usage, through charter, through imitation or bestowal by another city, operated with a specific law common to all cities. The city law with its rational character is the key explanatory statement for European cities and also a kind of summary for the positions of burghers, political associations, or the power of guilds. "Generally, on the continent legal institutions adaptable to capitalism appeared in city-law their origin is in the autonomy of the interested parties rather than in the Roman Commun Law.[2]

When the autonomy of urban community would be the basic theme for the analysis of urban society and beyond this, a criterion for the inquiring of urban existence, there has been a theoretical gap for Islamic cities. It should be kept in mind that the Weber's theory of city is not a search thoroughly on the history of medieval European city but also an attempt for the historical explanation of the development of capitalism. So looking for the original institutions of the European cities has not brought any structural analysis for these cities except lacking factors. When Western scholars first sought to understand the nature of the great Middle Eastern cities, they began by comparing them with the city states of classical Grace and Chirstian Europe. As a consequence, much has been made of features of urban life found in the West but 'lacking' in the East. Among these are the absence of municipal corporations, free cities, city councils, and civic mindedness.[3]

---

[2]Max Weber, The city, p. 183

[3]Daniel Bates and Amal Rassam, Peoples and Cultures of the Middle East, p. 163

Weber's neglect of the Muslim cities stems in part from his formulation of the city as an ideal type. He enumerates several economic and political criteria, but sees the decisive feature as the presence of autonomous, formally organized urban communes. Oriental (including Muslim) cities lack this crucial feature and hence are characterized as settlements which are cities only in an economic sense. His discussion of them serves only as a backdrop reaffirming the uniqueness of the West of cities in the full sense of the concept. This notion of the city formed the fundamental issue for the analysis of all cities.

The study of the Islamic city from this view point has been mainly the study of the specific character of civic life in Islam. For Stern, this would be the examining of the constitution of the Islamic city which distinguished it from the cities of other civilizations.[4] Constitution in the sense of character and structure, not in the narrow sense of the word, since one of the main points which he explained is that the Islamic city does not have constitution in that sense. He suggested that one of the most essential characteristics of the Islamic city is the looseness of its structure, the absence of corporate municipal institutions. Even though the first Islamic centuries saw a splendid development of urban civilization, this intense civic life did not produce formal, juridical, civic institutions.

The prolification of corporations is a particular characteristic of medieval Western civilization, however lack of it can not be used as a specific characterization of Islamic civilization. The difference from the Western cities has also been indicated by the Islamic experience and the internal qualities of Islamic supported the idea. In the Islamic world view there was the individual believer and there was the whole community of believers, but in between there was no stable grouping regarded as legitimate and permanent. Islamic law did not recognize corporate personality except in a limited sense, and the whole spirit of Islamic social thought went against the formation of limited groups within which there might grow up exclusive natural solidarity hostile to all inclusive solidarity of umma based on common obedience to God's commands.

---

[4] S.M. Stern, The Constitution of the Islamic City, pp. 25-26

Islam was used as the key analytical concept to describe an important aspect of social structure. So the most determinative quality of the religion is not taken into account which can be formulated as the integration with the state and religion in the society. Stern went a step further and pointed out the role of the state.[5] According to Stern, the absence of professional organizations is only one example of the absence of organizations in Islamic society. Seen in this light, the lack of municipal institutions is not an exception which needs to be explained, but a further example of this general rule, and to be explained in the same way as other examples, by those features of Islamic law and also by the fact that the power of the state was rooted in the city and this made it difficult for autonomous institutions to grow up.

Even though municipal privileges never existed, we could not say that urban life never existed for Islamic cities. Authors of the models accepted that the autonomous cities of classical world and of medievel cities, privileged corporations within a large state, or city states themselves are not the norm to which all cities at all times have tended to approach, but an exception which itself needs to be explained. Apart from the scientific criterion which takes the Islamic cities as an exception, there still has been an open question; what an Islamic city is.

On the other extreme of this approach, there is a trend which based every analytical study of the development of Islamic urbanization on religious tradition. The authors who are generally from Arab countries expressed their opinions on the Islamic city in the Colloquium held at the Middle East Center, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Cambridge in 1976.[6] The common point of the papers which have resemblences to the western counterparts is the religious character of the city. Beginning from the collective worship and the sophisticated fulfillment of daily religious obligations require an urban community, the transition from bedounism to sedentarization, the physical and social morphology of Muslim cities were attempted to be clarified by the nature of Islamic religion. In such a framework, the organization and functions of urban institutions

---

[5]Ibid., p. 15

[6]The Islamic City, Edit. by R.B. Serjeant, Unesco, 1980.

in traditional Muslim cities reflected the consistent concern of Muslim communities everywhere to live in accordance to the Seriat, conceived both as a system of laws and as a code of ethics.

"Islam prefers the sedentary to the nomad, the city dweller to the villager. It accepts the artisan but respects the merchants. The sword ranks lower than the pen. Religious knowledge is more desirable than wealth."[7] Although all these codes were interpreted as the Islamic ideal types in medievel periods they could not be taken as the sources of the foundation of urban structure. It would be more illustrative to seek the form of urban institutions which integrated with the religious ideology instead of saying no urban community cam possible have any institutions other than religious ones. The point must be expressed that the material and spiritual aspects of life are viewed as a continuum rather than a set of dichotomous entities or modes of existence in Islam. But there is nothing in Islam as such that predisposes narrow, winching streets.

Islamic cities were undoubtedly characterized by the existence amongst their inhabitants of a strong and highly developed sense of unity and social cohesion. But this sense of unity was not expressed in the form of municipal autonomy and local self government as had been the case with European cities. The members of society in a traditional Islamic city consider themselves first and foremost, members of the community of believer; the Ummah. The bonds that hold them together is not nationality, race or blood ties but the belief in the oneness of God and the duty to bear withness to Him, not only by lips but through all their daily endeavours. Hence there is no seperation between religious and secular activities in Islam. The Ummah was the notion of which every Muslim recognizes and feels himself to be a citizen, whether he lives alone or with a group, as a townsman or as a countryman. This notion was supported and fully realized by the state ideology, especially in the Ottoman society.

---

[7] L. Carl Brown, 'Heritage and Change in the Near Eastern City', in 'From Medina to Metropolis', p. 23

Spatial organization of this city, as on the societal level, reflected the religious principle. The shape of the Islamic city was determined only in part by the exigencies of power, but in part also by their being Islamic; or in other words, by the fact that the city is necessary for Islam, since it is only there that the virtuous life as Islam conceives it can be fully lived. The congregational mosque in the center of the city, the religious school beneath its shadow, the hierarchy of suqs, whose position in relation to mosque and schools was determined by the religious role of the goods they sold or the attitude of the şeriat towards them, the residental quarters with their ethnic or religious solidarity; all these existed and were where they were because the city was a Muslim city for the religious explanation.[8] The same organization has been evaluated in comparative viewpoint as the absence of gymnasium and theater in the Muslim town is functionally compensated for by the social and educational aspects of the mosque and from the eleventh century onward, by the existence of special institutions of legal and religious learning, the medreses.[9] The most disputable aspect of the spatial structure has been the residental units, mahalles. Quarters as homogenous communities whose solidarity was based on religious identity supported the idea of social cohesion in an urban community.

The historical perspective on the nature of Islamic urbanization was mainly based on the Arab urbanization. The analysis of the Islamic city realized by western scholars did not focus on the internal dynamic of this process but insisted on the subject of existence of municipal autonomy and local self goverment. On the other side, tribal loyalties and affiliations continued to influence the ecological and social structure of the Islamic city. The individual and the family were closely bound by tribal customs and traditions, and it was an important factor in determining the social status of the individual in urban society. The number of quarters in the city depended upon the extent of social heterogeneity of its population. Generally the population was differentiated on the basis of any one, or any combination of the following factors; tribal affiliation, indigenous or immigrant status, religious

---

[8] A.H. Hourani, The Islamic City, p. 12

[9] G.E. von Grunebaum, The Structure of the Muslim Town

affiliation, social class and occupation.[10] The residental zone of the
Muslim city was a mosaic of various quarters.

In this mosaic, it would be seen two special characteristics
at the same time; one was the combination of local with ethnic or
religious differentiation, and the second relative separateness and auto-
nomy of each quarters or group of quarters. Not only the tribal structure
but the methods of administration and tax-collection strengthened and
perpetuated the separateness of these groups. Each quarter had a chief
called a şeyh or arif -imam for Ottoman mahalles with some different
characteristics of the mahalle who was its spokesman and governer, also
they were local notables to supervise local affairs. As the units of
taxation, when global fees were levied by the state, the şeyhs negotiated
the tax and probably themselves divided and collected it within the
districts. The analysis of the way of integration of these communities in
the city life has been the lacking factor of the existent Islamic city
theory. In such a point the theory repeated itself as in this quotation.
"The quarters were small integrated communities, their close family ties,
ethnic or religious heterogeneity, economic and administrative unity,
quasi physical isolation and the character of their mediating elites made
them villages or village like communities within the larger cities."[11]

"It is difficult to imagine how without associations of the
citizens or communes to manage local affairs, Muslim cities had any
sort of common public life (..) Deprived of autonomy, their populations
it is alleged, were not truly communities, but just dense agglomerations
of isolated souls or dispersed families subject to the rule of the
military elites, often foreign, who governed the territories in which
the cities lay."[12] If we accept these agglomerations as cities it will
bring the problem that of Weber's five marks two at least are missing in
the Islamic city. It would usually have a market, a wall and distinctively
urban forms of association;[13] but it had no legal privileges conferred
by the state, for the seriat recognized no privileges for one group
of believers above others; nor it did posses autonomy. The idea that the

---

[10] Riaz Hassan, Islam and Urbanization in the Medieval Middle
East in Ekistics, 1972

[11] I.M. Lapidus, The Islamic City, p. 199

[12] Ibid., p. 195

[13] This aspect of the city is suspicous and questionable for Hourani,.
See, The Islamic City in the Light of Recent Research, in the Islamic City

Islamic city was able to maintain its personality, its power of collective action, throughout Islamic history when it never possessed municipal institutions was a paradoxical view point.

When this personality is considered as Islam, this is to envisage the city as being limited simply to those urban groups which are organized under the eagis of Islam. This is also to reduce the lives of individuals as well as societies to the worship of the One God and the authority of Divine Law; and to leave no domain to conceive the organization of political power, and the other means of social control. In so doing, the state authority could not be taken into account for the analysis of power groups. When the Şeriat conceived as the unique system of law, all official mechanism were interpreted in this code. So on urban base, such a result would be possible; "Indeed it was because of the integration of Muslim societies on the basis of Islam, that alternative forms of political associations, whether racial, territorial or municipal, have been rejected or by-passed".[14] Islamic tradition might be a starting point for the analysis of urban structure, but to remain within these limits does not clarify the urban network which must entail intermediate institutions such as vakıfs.

None of two approaches outlined could explain the social character of the cities. Although they highlight certain characteristic features of social structure, they do not provide a framework which is necessary to explain the urban structure. If there is a problem for conceptualization of the Muslim city, then some form of association distinct to urban life in these cities must be discerned. I will try to focus on institutional, social and spatial structure of the Islamic city in the context of Muslim cultural tradition and to reevaluate this information for the Ottoman society. It seems to be necessary to define the urban structure to understand the vakıfs as an urban organization integrated with the urban community.

---

[14] M. Abdel Rahim, Legal Institutions, in The Islamic City, (unesco) p. 42

1.1. Guild System

There was one type of socio-religious institution which affected
the life of Islamic city the professional corporation, guild. The guild
system comprised all those engaged in economic production, distribution
and services. With the exception of high goverment bureucrats, army
officers and ulema the town population was organized in guilds according
to the crafts and trades. Not only artisans and merchants were thus
organized but also people engaged in services such as singers, brokers,
auctioneers, musicians, story-tellers, donkey drivers and boatmen.
The guild system embraced owners of starch factories, tanneries, dye houses,
sulphur workshops and similar activities which were not located in the
bazars but on the edge of the city because of bad smell. High in status
and low, rich and poor, Muslims, Christians, and Jews, natives or resident
aliens they all belonged to the guild system.[15]

Guild system showed differences according to the regions and
historical periods, although they performed important social and economic
functions in the public life of all Islamic cities. The survey on the
guild history in Egypt, Syria and Turkey from the tenth to the twentieth
centuries was realized by G. Baer.[16] Up to the fifteenth century we have
no definite information about the existence of guilds but scattered items
of information about chiefs of specific crafts or trades. As in Anatolia,
the prevalent kind of association of the thirteenth and fourteenth
centruies was the organization of the ahi movement of young men who adopted
the ideal of futuwwa; although they were recuited mainly among the
craftsmen, the association as such was non-professional. The study of
Syrian and Egyptian town in Mamluk times conclude that there is no indication
that the artisans and traders were organized in a corporation. The first
guild documents date from the second half of the fifteenth century and
relate to Anatolia. (The fusion of the ahi movement with specific guilds)
Similar documents relating to specific guilds in Egypt date from the late
sixteenth or early seventeenth century. By the end of the seventeenth

---

[15] Yusuf Ibish, Economic Institutions, in The Islamic City, p. 114

[16] G. Baer, Guild in Middle Eastern History, in 'Studies in the
Economic History of the Middle East, Edit. by M.C. Cook, 1970, pp. 10-30

century the guilds in Ottoman as well as in Egypt had become an all-embracing system of organization of the urban population.

The guild organization achieved its fullest development by sanction of the goverment, under its auspices and as a result of its administrative and fiscal policy. There is also a thought that the guilds of Egypt and Anatolia were maintained from above and the system in which they were integrated was organized from above, not from below.[17] However, we could not say that the state created and controlled the Ottoman guilds, they always have internal autonomy in varying degrees. The goverment interfered in the guild organization only to protect the interest of the treusary or the general public and did not intervene in their internal affairs. The guild regulations also recognized the higher authority of the state. The internal organization of the guilds and their relation to the urban community will be explained in the chapter on Ottoman society, here I'll try to demonstrate the meaning of guilds in the context of Islamic city.

Guilds were evaluated as the defining features of the Muslim city when the Weber's ideal type of the city has been accepted. Massignon asserted that craft and mercantile guilds were the institutional cement of Muslim cities. Since guilds were at one time important in the development of European cities, Massignon tried to read a parallel significance into what he saw as their Muslim counterparts.[18] Such corporations created within the framework of the brotherhoods of mystics provided the basis of urban society in the Muslim world: of solidarity between man and man, and of individual self respect, the craftsman's belief in the worth of his own labour. For him, Islamic city has distinctively urban form of association but no municipal institution did evolve even the guilds would have been a natural basis for them.

Cahen has doubts on Massignon's theory of the professional corporations and shows that they were not guilds in the medievel European sense, but, in so far they existed, were instruments of state control.[19] For such a view, it is necessary to indicate the connection between the

---

[17]Ibid., p. 29

[18]S.M. Stern, The Islamic City, pp.37-42

[19]Ibid., p. 14

guilds and the state and the means of the control when the social and
economic distinctions in the guilds are taken into account. As long as no
other system of control was available the state would use the given
system. Even they have an internal autonomy and a certain community of
feeling and interest among those who practices the same craft, their
independence and authority may have been limited in the urban society.

The religious and social functions of the European guilds have
their parallels in the Islamic world, where the crafts gradually came under
the influence of religious ideals, and adopt elements of the futuwwa;
just as in Europe the guilds have their patron saints, so do the Islamic
crafts tend to choosefor themselves saintly patron. Also the internal
divisions between masters, apprentices and journeymen have parallels in
the Islamic crafts. There are, however great differences.[20] The Islamic
crafts show a much less institutional organization than that developed
by the Europea guilds. While in a number of cities the guilds have never
thrown off the supervision of municipal control, in other cities of
Europe the artisans associations claimed an autonomy which often involved
them in disputes, not only with authority but also with one another.
From the first half of the thirteenth century, they demanded the right
of self goverment, of meeting to discuss their concerns of possessing
a bell and a seal, and even of sharing the goverment of the town with the
merchants in whose hand it was centralized. In the course of the fourteenth
century, they were successful in obtaining, although not everywhere, the
right to nominate their own doyens and jures, to be recognized as a political
body and to share authority with the bourgoisie.[21] Nothing like this
happened in Islam; the craft organizations never assumed a proper corporative
form, any more than did civic organizations.

---

[20]Ibid., p. 46

[21]H. Pirenne, Economic and Social History of Europe, London 1958,
pp. 181-185   .

1.2. Intra-Urban Communities

The principle institutions in traditional Muslim cities under the
domination of the Caliph or Sultan have been written according to their
hierarchical order.

a. Vali (i.e. Provincial Governer), generally assisted by Subaşı;

b. Kadı (or judge) assisted by a panel of approved withesses or notaries;

c. Muhtesip (i.e. the supervisor of markets and public morality assisted
by the heads of various professions and by the arif (imams) of city
quarters; and

d. in addition there were the leaders of the Protected Communities i.e.
the Jews and Christians who, in accordence with the precepts of the şeriat,
enjoyed a kind of autonomous status in the cities.[22] The variations in
the administrative system of the city can not be indicated with in such
a generalization but it is necessary to point out the over-all structure.

The primary function of the official appointed as the governer
was the maintenance of law and order throughout a given province or
district. Kadı was the sole judicial authority in a Muslim city or
community, a judge administering both şeriat and kanun. In the Ottoman
system, moreover, the kadı exercised not only judicial functions, but also
a degree of general supervision over the conduct of the administration,
i.e. to control the actions of the custom departments and to certify
the accounts before they were submitted to Paşa. The function of Muhtasib
was to promote the application of Muslim ethical values in the day-to day
life of Islamic society, especially in commercial and social transactions
in the market place. In its classic and fully developed form, the
institution of Muhtesip was an important municipal post with a recognizable
and generally agreed set of different functions.

As protector and promoter of decent standards of conduct in public
life, Muhtesip had the responsibility of ensuring that the practitioners
of professions such as medicine, apothecary and teaching, were probably
qualified and did not indulge in unfair or unethical practices. They
inspected all baths, tested water and drainage, and kept close watch

---

[22]Muddathir Abdel-Rahim, Legal Institutions, in 'The Islamic City'
(unesco, 1980) p.44

on the activities of the bathkeepers. Under the Ottomans, especially from the time of Beyazıd II onward, the functions of Muhtesip were incorporated in the kanunnames which governed the administration of provinces. According to these laws, the functions of Muhtesip in the Ottoman Empire were expanded to include the collection of a wide variety of taxes and dues.[23] Given the nature of his responsibilities, Muhtasib was naturally expected to be a man of good character, authority and have at least, a working knowledge of şeriat laws and was regarded to have a thorough knowledge of the customs and tradition of the inhabitants of the city. The Muhtesib who was selected among the ulema, merchants and officials thus embodied both the ulema concern for moral order and the fiscal interest of the state.

In the later middle ages, the leading ulema and the imperial elite constituted the foregoing social groups of urban society. The leading ulema were the most respected members of the community. The imperial elite, holders of the highest offices in the state administration, embodied the directing interest of the empire. Their status reflected the power and wealth of the state itself. Awe of political power made all status a function of proximity to the state. Religious dignity, however, was an independent basis of social esteem.[24] Scholars, teachers and divines who embodied the ideals of the community earned this respect. The different criteria in use introduced an ambiguity into status ranking. Political power, at least from one point of view, might be decisive, but from the religious point of view it was also corrupting.

"The ulema were an administrative and social as well a religious elite. This social group was that part of Muslim community learned in the literature, laws, and doctrines of Islam. They were judges, jurists, prayer leaders, scholars, readers of Kuran, reciters of tradition, functionaries of mosque and so on. Their essential duty was to preserve the divine will, and to sustain the community as an Islamic community and give it religious and moral guidence. In Islam, religion manifests itself not only in thelogy, but also in a divinely inspired law by which

---

[23] Encylopaedus of Islam, III, p. 489

[24] I. Lapidus, Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages. (Horward, 1967) p. 81

all civil affairs are ordered. (..) All realms of public affairs were an intrinsic part of the duties of this multicompetant, undifferentiated and unspecialized communal elite".[25] The ulema were closely intermeshed with the bureaucratic class. Many were appointed by the state. Many ulema were also made careers in the non religious, financial and secreterial service just as professional scribes and accountants qualified as members of the ulema by knowledge of tradition or law and sometimes by part-time teaching.

The connection between the commercial bourgeoisie and the ulema were also exceedingly close. This connection had several aspects: members of the bourgeois families took of learning, men of learning married into such families, the ulema possesed a certain economic and social power through their control of evkaf and both groups shared an interest in a stable, prosperous and cultivated urban life. Members of the great bourgeois families and of the ulema together provided an urban leadership: their wealth, piety, culture and ancient names gave them social prestige and the patronage of quarters, ethnic or religious groups, crafs or the city as a whole.[26]

Muslim cities were divided into these classes, but their relationship to each other formed cohesive patterns of public life. Strong solitarities based on the residential quarters of the cities, an attenuated form of professional and guild association in the market district and over religious affiliations cut across class divisions to create a more broadly based communal life. Thus merchants, officials and military elite were associated with the schools (Shafi, Hanafi, Maliki and Hanbali) as patrons, and common people regarding themselves as their members looked to the ulema for advice, representation and leadership. These were informal ties and the leadership of the ulema was by no means institutionalized for political purposes. The schools served rather as channels for the spread of their influence, the communication of their views, and the persuasion of the populace. The sochools of law were the most comprehensive intra-urban communities, but they did not necessarly encompass the whole population.

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 107-108

[26] A.H. Hourani, The Islamic City, p. 18

Thus in the absence of strong and comprehensive associational ties, we may have the impression of a passive society with the quarters too parochial, the crafts too little organized, and other fraternal associations too much on the periphery of society on which a hierarchy of control has been imposed. Beneath the ruler lay a whole system of control, the governor and his "household", the goverment offices, the muhtasib who maintained order, the kadı who administered justice, other functionaries who supervised public acts of worship, the heads of quarters, of villages, of crafts and of non-Muslim communities, who the goverment held responsible for the payment of taxes and the maintenance of order and obedience.

When formal institutions do not exist and the exercise of power is not defined, political roles tend to be ambigous. The notables, the leaders of the bourgoisie and the ulema obeyed the goverment not only from fear of self-interest, but from concern for peace at almost any price which was the principle of Islamic society, from the final need of the city for political power and authority to bring in food-supply from the rural hinterland to keep the trade-routes open.[27] In general a relatively stable balance existed, a strong goverment ruled in close partnership with the urban groups, and the influence of the leader was thrown on the side of existing order. But there were other times when the balance was shaken and because of a weaking of authority or the widening gap between the interests of the ruler and those of the townspeople, the urban leaders and notables could emerge as organizers of protest. But it did not often happen that such a movement taken to the point of overturning of authority. Stern points out that it was in general only at the moment of interregnum, when a dynasty or state had collapsed or been defected that the local leaders came forward as a provincial goverment: they would administer the city for a time until one of them emerged as ruler, or until they must hand it over to its new master.[28]

---

[27] Ibid., p. 19

[28] Ibid., p. 22

Lapidus explains why it was that, such rare exceptions apart, the local leaders could not take place of the rulers. On the one hand, the popular forces which they could use or manipulate were themselves divided; the only effective popular associations were those based on the quarters, there were no effective professional organizations on city-wide basis, except for certain marginal and anti-social associations whom the higher orders of the city could only control and use up to a point. On the other, the active leadership tended to be in the hands of the ulema, the religious element in the upper bourgeoisie, and they, because of their very conception of society and their place in it, were not able to integrate the various elements of the city into a political whole. This could only be done by the military rulers; hence the long predominance of Turkish or Mamluk ruling groups, acting both as rulers and as patrons or local leaders, until much later the decline of Ottoman authority led to the reemergence of local leaders in the provincial cities.

In the fluid situation of Muslim town, public and political life was no more differentiatited from the mass of religious, economic, familial and communal concerns than were any of the other functions from each other. Public affairs fit into the comprehensive structure of these overlapping solidarity and functional groupings. The institutionalization of vakıf must be considered in such a framework; its religious and economic aspects integrated with the urban community. Traditional norms and pious principles and the ties of obligation were inherent in the system of relations as a whole.

1.3. The Spatial Structure

To see the physical shape of the Islamic city simply as a reflection of its social structure would be a weak point. A city can not be just an external sign of a system of social ethics or social institutions. However, we could say that spatial forms implicate the element of social life through the interaction of the social elements which constitute them. Such a link in every different social structure must be an explanatory starting point. Similar to the institutional aspect of the theory, the spatial organization of the Islamic city was described mainly by an absent factor, planning.

The variables which determine or influence the organization of these units and whether they have any Islamic character are the main

points. Before such an analysis it must be accepted that there are many
factors which affect the shape of the city, first of all pyhsical
factors. A city must have an adequate supply of water, it must have an
adequate hinterland of cultivable land, its streets and buildings will
follow the countours of the land on which it is built. Apart from these
physical factors its shape will be affected by an uncounted multiplicity
of individual choices not always known as such. In order to devise a
physical portrait of the city and to recognize urban morphology, generally
the plan of the city should be taken as a study map. In so doing, we can
not find a planning endeavor in the sense of classical town planning
except some early Muslim creation cities as the Round City of Baǧdat.[29]
However, there was a strict line of regulations in the Islamic cities on
the physical lay-out aimed a very functional organization of the space.
I'll assert this issue in the section where Ottoman society studied in
detail. Here, I want to concentrate on the spatial qualities of the city
which are related to Islam.

Sauvaget contrasts the regular plan of the ancient cities and
the tortuous streets of their Islamic successors, and shows how the
straight, proticoed streets of antiquity were gradually encroached upon
by shops and houses in the Islamic period, resulting in a new townscape.[30]
According to this standpoint, the physical shape of what we usually call
the Islamic city was that of the Greco-Roman city which had preceded it,
but somewhat changed by the dynamic forces of Islamic society. "The
classical cities with their broad colonnaded avenues, temples, market
places, and rectangles of streets, were slowly transformed but kept
traces of their first state. When the Arabs came, mosques and palaces,
gradually took the places of temples and cathedrals or were built on the
agora; a certain lack of grandeur in the Islamic conception of the city,
and the emphasis of Islamic law on the individual led to the gradual
encroachment of shops and dwellings on the broad avenues, and when the
period of anarchy succeded that of early caliphate, the insecurity of life
caused the population to withdraw into the city-quarters, small units
where the ties of neighbourhood were reinforced by those of common

---

[29] J.M. Wagstaff, The Origin and Evolution of Town, in 'The Changing
Middle Eastern City, Edit. by G.H. Blake and R.T. Lawless.

[30] S.M. Stern, The Islamic City, pp. 25-50

religious allegiance or ethnic origin. With this, the city ceased to exist as a moral unity".[31]

Why the transformation of the spatial structure brought the disappearance of moral unity has not been explained, this is the result of a general current which perceives the existence of quartes as the sign of the absence of the urban community. In other words, this way of looking is to accept the spatial structure as a unique variable for social analysis. A very similar spatial transformation had been lived in İstanbul after the conquest. But the event is evaluated as the shaping of İstanbul was being influenced by the Turkish concept of communal life. "The Roman and Byzantine concern to foster free discussion, political debate and entertainment in public places was foreign to the Turks. The quiet courtyards and streets of the Külliye should never be compared with the agora of forum of ancient times. The Turks did not use the courtyards of the mosques as meeting places; they met in open-air cafes usually situated close to the mosque and besides as well, overhung by spreading plane trees. Theirs was not, therefore and architecturally ordered square with a geometrically ordained position in relation to a networks of roads, but a green tent in a shadows of a mosque."[32]

In general, the Islamic city evolves sponteneously without recourse to plan or model, climate and topographic conditions were the affective determinants except for the advantageous positioning of the mosque and külliye. An Islamic city should have a central complex shaped along a grid pattern. At the heart of the complex would be the great mosque and the medreses. Next to the cami was the suq, çarşı or the market place, which included workshops, warehouses and hans. The localization of ruling centers or palaces must be considered in a different context which includes the variables as the expression of power and the military concern. For Grunebaum, the fullfledged Muslim town has two focal points, the Friday mosque and the market.[33] The cami, as a spiritual center, is in general appropriately placing along the main thoroughfare or where the plan of the town permits, at the rectangular crossing of two main

---

[31] Hourani, The Islamic City, p. 13

[32] Göknil Vogt, Living Architecture: Ottoman, p. 61

[33] G.V. von Grunebaum, The Structure of Muslim Town, p. 73

thoroughfares which is marked by a spread-out square. The cami is the political as well as religious center of the settlement. Here it is where the inhabitants will gather to hear the proclomations of their rulers and they will, on accasion, demonsrate their political will by their tumultuous presence or again effectively by their demonstrative absence. And the cami is also the intellectual center of the town. The ulema will assemble in it to discuss and teach; in cities famed for their learned, the circle of students grouped around the şeyhs.

Near the mosque as a religious center we will find the suppliers of sanctuary, the suq of the candle merchants, the dealers in incence and other perfumer. Near the mosque, as an intellectual center we will find also the suq of booksellers, the suq of bookbinder and, as its neighbor, the suq of the leather merchants and the masters of slippers, all of whom are in one way or another concerned with leather goods. Adjoining the group of markets, it is entered the halls of the dealers in textiles, the kervansaray the only section of the suqs which is regularly roofed and which can be locked and where, therefore, precious materials other than fabrics will also be stored and exchanged. The characteristic spatial quality of the bazar in which all the sellers and craftsmen in particular trade are gathered together in one location was reinforced. Moreover, by forcing all potential buyers and sellers together, the market was created in which a fair and competitive price should be determined.

The market, bazar or suq, might be covered thus forming one vast indoor shopping area, or it might be simply a section of the city's central area devoted to the sale of goods or craft manufacturing. The bazar area contained hans for travelling merchants and for workers coming from villages. Also there would be food sellers, gunsmiths, jewelery, many changers, and the like. Markets dealing in luxury items or expensive manufactured goods such as fine cloth, gold and silverwork, copper utensil and weapons, then tended to be located centrally in the city adjacent to the grand mosque and secured with gates and guards. Spices, condiments, and imported food items would be sold in this area as well, while food, stables, animals and animal products would be sold in the less centrally located markets or outside the city altogether.[34]

---

[34]D. Bates and A. Rassam, Peoples and Cultures of the Middle East, p.

The basic units of spatial and social organization were the city quarters or neighborhoods, mahalles. In the quarter "the right of the family to live enclosed in its house led ....to a clear seperation between public and private life; private life turned inwards, towards the courtyard and not towards the street; in the thoroughfares, the bazars, and the mosques, a certain public life went on, policed and regulated by the ruler, active and at times rebellious, but a life where the basic units, the families, touched externally without mingling to form activitas".[35] As for the family, Islamic law recognizes the right of each household to privacy within its own walls. This valued privacy is expressed everywhere in domestic architecture and the use of urban space. Those who could afford to traditionally built houses of several stories around a central courtyard or compound. The housing was always oriented away from the streets, doors seldom faced one another. The lack of external windows also helped solve the climatic problem of great heat in the summers and cold in the winters. Streets were narrow and twisted. They were designed to serve the needs of the householders rather than facilitate general traffic. It is easy to see the seeking of privacy on the spatial organization of residential quarters, but this fact should not be interpreted as a complete withdrawal from the public life.[36] The passive character of the urban people compared with the European counterparts on the participation of the public affair and the traditional way of life, even the house itself was divided between public rooms and private family space, may give the meaning of an interior life. It would not, however, be true to say that there was no public life in the Islamic cities or in any other urban civilization.

The important thing is to establish the institutional base for any kind of public life. What is distinctive for the Islamic city is the vakıf institution and the complex of buildings associated with the central mosque, the medreses, the production and exchange places in which religious, commercial and cultural activities are concentrated. The quality and volume of public life in this social centers indicates the internal dynamic of the urban community.

---

[35]Hourani, The Islamic City, p. 24

[36]G.V. von Grunebaum, The Structure of the Muslim Town, p. 148

II. THE OTTOMAN SOCIETY AND VAKIF INSTITUTION

2.1. Settlement Policy and Land System

Ottoman Empire was a highly urbanized structure. Beginning from
the Seljuks, Ottoman had a settlement policy. In fact, a systematic policy
of settlement and colonization was pursued by the Seljuks and maintained
more vigorously by the Ottomans, who established Turkish settlements and
colonies in Rumelia. The Ottomans used two methods of settlement; the first
one was the encouraging people to form settlements at a particular place
where the state created new posibilities for them, the second one was
the moving people from one place and settling them in a new place, i.e.
compulsory settlement. This method was called sürgün, i.e. exile, at the
time it was applied.[1] Both methods were used in establishing settlements
in cities and rural areas.

In the process of the establishment of empire, the colonizing
Turkish dervishes who belonged to the Ahi organizations played a very
important role. At the same time, the role of the colonizing devishes in
spreading Islam as far as distant territories and settling many nomadic
Turkish tribes in remote and lonely parts of the empire was particularly
noteworthy.[2] They were the earliest individual contributors to the realization
of the objectives of the state's constructional policy. Their activities
continued as a large scale until the end of the sixteenth century, but
lost its force in the seventeenth century. Zaviye, a dervish hospice, was
the constructed building for the continuation of this activity.

For settlements and constructions the sultans and viziers erected
large vakıf buildings, not only in important cities, but also in town and
even in small rural settlements. Such establishments in rural areas had
pioneering role and led to the growth of town and cities. Originally small,
walled settlements at the time of their conquest by the Turks, Bursa and
Edirne grew very rapidly within a short time due to the individual
construction activity of Sultans, viziers and private citizens and
developed as a very important urban centers. It must be remarked that the

---

[1] F.M. Göçek, "Sürgün" Policy in The Ottoman Empire, A Study of the
Ottoman Deportation Policy in 14th to 17th Centuries. Master of Arts in
Sociology, Boğaziçi Universitesi, 1981

[2] Ö.L. Barkan, 'Osm. İmparatorluğunda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon
metodu olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler', Vakıflar Dergisi, 1942, p. 285

vakıf system was also employed in ensuring the continuity of constructional activity in rural areas. In order to provide zaviyes with a steady livelihood, zaviye vakıfs in the form of agricultural organizations were generally established in their close vicinity.

When the Sultans and viziers created new vakıf establishments, they always took the necessary measures to turn these places into new settlements. They encouraged people to move there providing them with job opportunities and other amenities thus making the new settlement attractive to newcomers. Those settled by the method of compulsory settlement were exempt from the customary tax known avarız-ı divaniye and taxes levied during emergencies. They paid most other taxes at considerable reduction. The special right of the 'sürgün' were clearly stated in royal degrees. These people enjoyed these special privileges until they adopted to their environment and become fully productive. Some newly conquered cities were also developed by the same methods.

In some cities new parishes and quarters grew around the imaret complexes, while imarets establishes in small settlements led to the growth of large urban center. Another important role of these imaret complexes was that they led to greater settlement where they were established; the menzil sites -road side social centers- established at strategic points along trade routes did not only contribute to the development of trade in their environment, but through the mosque, mescits and even the schools and dervish cloisters which some of them included, they helped to encourage Turks to settle in the region and thus became areas of military support during the period of expansion of the Empire. To investigate the plans of Bursa, Edirne, İstanbul and many other cities of Anatolia and Balkan demonstrates that the development of the towns would be around the monumental buildings which formed the imaret complexes. In rebuilding the Ottoman cities and mediating between commerce and the economy, the construction of imarets, each a complex of religious and commercial institutions, play a desicive part. Always established as a pious fondation, an imaret consisted of religious and charitable institutions on the one hand, and the mercantile establishments such as bedestan, kervansaray, han, covered bazars, market places on the other. The later group was designed to provide for the expenses of the former.

"Social, religious and cultural facilities such as schools
(medreses), soup kitchens (aşhane), quest houses (tabhane),
hospitals (tımarhane and darüşşifa), bath houses (hamam), and
cervansarays which were generally established around a mosque;
municipal affairs such as water supply, sewage system and houses
for large number of employees in these establishments; and the
revenue producing foundations such as large commercial buildings,
mills, candle workshops, dye houses (boyahane), slaughterhouses
(salhane), store house for sheep heads and trotters (başhane)
and outdoor markets which were assigned to craftsmen and
merchants; all these usually formed the nucleus of a newly rising
city or of an old city."[3]

In the Ottoman empire all agricultural land was miri -crown land-
belonging to the state. The only exceptions were mülk -freehold- and
vakıf land, which would remain or be revised at the sultan's discretion.
The resources of such urban complexes which were created by the sultans
and high ranking statesmen were supplied by the state treasury. As the
country was regarded as the property of the ruler, he was not required
to draw up a mülkname (certificate of property ownership) before he
established a vakıf over a piece of land and when the ruler founded a
vakıf, it simply ceased to be public property and assumed the nature of
vakıf property. Other individuals needed the sultan's permission or
duration and had to draw up a mülkname before they could turn a particular
piece of land into a vakıf.

It seems appropriate to explain the tımar in the classical
Ottoman system briefly to understand the mechanisms which provide the
necessary resources for urban complexes in operation. In this system,
agricultural land belongs to the state. As the sultans increased their
power slowly the tımar system developed parallel to the foundation of
the empire. To implement the tımar regime the state had to establish its
own absolute control of land, unimpeded by any private property rights-
Tımar system was a means for paying the soldiers and to keep an administrative
class without cash. The peasant had the status of an hereditary tenant,
and in return for his labour he enjoyed a usufructary right. The incomes
from villages reserved for the sultan (that is for the central state
Treasury), viziers and beys, was deducted, and the remain distributed

[3] Ö.L. Barkan, 'Osm. İmparatorluğunda İmaret Sitelerinin Kuruluş ve
İşleyiş tarzına ait Araştırmalar', İst. Üni. İkt. Fak. Mec. XXIII, 1-2,
p. 239

among the sipahis as tımars and zeamets. A zeamet was formally the fief
of a subaşı, who was in the army and responsible for the maintenance of
order in his district, with an annual value of between twenty and one
hundred thousand akces. The first group fief which was a domain of sultan,
prince of blood, beylerbeyi or sancak beyi yielding an annual revenue of
more than one hundred thousand akçes was called has.

In order to establish the tımar system and especially to maintain
a continous and centralized control needed, the goverment had to determine
in detail all sources of revenue in the provinces and to prepare registers
showing the distribution of these resources. The state would give the
right and the authority of collecting taxes to a large extent to the officials
in charge in the names of tımar, malikane or vakıf. In this system, all
statesmen including the sultan congregate both the religious and political
sovereignty over the land and reaya which were assigned in kanunnames and
they organized their private budget and performed their duties as
officials. Miri land, about 87 per cent of the land, was under the control
of the state in 1528. However, the 47 per cent of all income taxes
(%73 in the provinces of Anatolia, Karaman, Rumelia, and Zülkadiriye and
%69 in the province of Diyarbakır) which remained the outside of Sultan's
has was in the hands of different holdings which were granted to the
viziers, sipahis, and vakıf foundations. These holdings had also their
own budgets of the beginning of the sixteenth century.[4] In such a system,
there was always a potential trend for decentralization in relation to
the political power originating from the tax system itself, even in the
classical period of the empire.

The struggle between the state and individuals to gain possession
of the land was the source of a very important social problems throughout
the history of the Ottoman state. Whenever the state was wealthy there
would be a sudden increase in the amount of land held as private property
or as vakıf; whenever a sovereign established a strong, central authority,
he would abolish private property rights and vakıfs and re-establish
state control. Beyazıd I and, especially, Mehmed the Conqueror are famous

---

[4] Ö.L. Barkan,'Osm. İmp. Bütçelerine Dair Notlar' İkt. Fak. Mec.
XVII, 1-4, p. 243

as such   reformers.[5] After Mehmed the Conqueror had reviewed all land
holdings throughout the empire in about 1470, he established the principle
that all vakafs which did not accepted the sultan's sanction that
buildings or purpose no longer existed should revert to the state. In this
way more than twenty housand villages and farms became miri lands. In
Anadolia, he left some of the land in the possession of landowners and
dervishes from the former Islamic states, but required each of them to
send a fully armed cavalryman to the army. In the reign of this successor,
Bayezıd II, there was a reaction against Mehmed's reform, their opponents
claimed that they did not conform to the seriat and most of the private
holdings and vakıfs reverted to their original owners.

> "The formation of private holdings through granting from the miri
> land goes back to the foundation stages of the Ottoman Empire and
> even to the earliest Islamic States. For instance, the Bolu register
> numbered 544 in the state archives indicates that the earliest
> Ottoman rulers granted land holdings to their friends from the
> army. Apart from these records, in the Bursa evkaf registers
> numbered 1049 we can find that Osman and Orhan gazis granted land
> holdings to the şeyhs, dervish and ahis. The increase of these
> granted holdings and the endowed miri land let a more and more
> land to escape from the direct state control and to exempt from
> certain taxes and finally to lose their character as tımar
> lands."[6]

The early Ottoman rulers granted large holdings and concessions
to groups such as Ahis and dervish orders and persons who were believed to
help in the organization of the state. However, the event of granting land
should not be considered only as a outcome of a necessity felt during the
period of the foundation and traditionally developed in time, but a
practice necessiated by the structure of the state itself. The economic
and technological conditions of the medievel centuries created the tımar
system in which the state transfered a kind of authority to local
representatives for realization not only a military power, but at the
same time to manage public services instead of the state.

---

[5]H. İnalcık, The Ottoman Empire; The Classical Age 1300-1600, p. 109

[6]Y. Yücel, 'Osm. İmparatorluğunda Decentralizasyona Dair Gözlemler',
Belleten, 1974, p. 673

In this network, the land vakıfs —toprak vakıfları— was one of
the major themes which have received importance to explain the potential
factor for decentralization. Although the state had the right of entry in
the holdigns to collect taxes; agnâm resmi (çift resmi: a farm tax paid
in cash by Muslim reaya) and cizye (the tax paid by non-Muslims), the
land vakıfs have a different status within the control system. The state
inspected every piece of land, especially the tımar holdings of sipahis
through the officials named as 'mevkufçu eminleri' and took the part
of production accumulated as 'defter fazlası' for its own possession.
These land holdings, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, provided
the three fifth of all state revenues and formed the administrative orga-
nizations open to the state's intervention. The one fifth of the state
revenue belonged to the state property (padişah hasları) and the
remaining part was supplied by the land vakıf.[7]

One principle was that only private property might be assigned
as vakıf, or since in general agricultural land was declared not to be
private property but to be state land, it followed that the only lands
already lawfully assigned to vakıf were those which the reigning sultan
and his predecessors had either so assigned themselves or else presented
as private property who had then used them for this purpose.[8] Parallel
to the increasing status of a stateman, as being a sancakbeyi, a beylerbeyi
or a vizier, his granted holdings enlarged from villages to towns and
became a has in time. If that stateman was appreciated, the property of
the holdings would be converted into private property by the mere will
and motion of a sultan. The affair was named as temlik, and the legal
document as temlikname. Most of these land were turned to vakıf and
stayed in the family's ownership in years.

> "The escape from the state treasury of the miri lands required
> to continue as dirlik especially for military purposes, for
> supporting the charitable foundations, was only possible by means
> of granting. Sultan too endowed the revenue of many villages to
> charitable foundations under his name. Vakıfs called 'evkaf-ı
> selatin' can be given as an example of possibility of endowment of
> the land without any granting (temlik) operation. The number of
> villages endowed to the tekkes by the sultans was not small.

---

[7] Ö.L. Barkan, 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Toprak Vakıflarının İdari-
Mali Muhtariyeti Meselesi', Türk Hukuk Dergisi, 1941-42, pp. 13-15

[8] H.A. Gibb and H. Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, Oxford,
1957, p. 166

> Whereas a village or a group of villages endowed to a vakıf
> through granting malikane—the part of the taxes collected from
> the endowed land was left to a private person were called
> 'malikane vakıf' the land or villages which were assigned to
> tekkes by the Sultan as the head of the state were named 'vakıf
> tımar'."[9]

The vakıfs of the sultan, the viziers and high-ranking Ottoman officals enjoyed the administrative and financial autonomy as the most important quarantee provided for vakıf properties. The vakıf system gave the individual benefactor the absolute assurance from any outside interference and the property was taken granted for continuity. The state officials were not allowed to enter such vakıfs and properties to collect taxes or for any other purpose. The villagers living in this land were exempted from military services, from working in the construction of gates, from the duty of a courier and the various kind of taxes (zahire bahası, selamet akçesi or maden sarrafı). The vakıf reaya who had a specially priveleged status worked for the increase of vakıf wealth. The vakıf benefactor had the state quarantee and protection with a royal decree which demonstrates that the state gave up its rights in perpetuity.[10]

According to Barkan, the state did not see any inconvenience to appropriate the revenues of any region for public services and charitable endowments did not want to prevent the administrative and financial autonomy of the vakıfs, beyond the intentions this policy was unavoidable in the economic conditions of that time.[11] It is important to point out that the founders of land vakıfs really were a part of the administrative class. Although the sultans did not lay down certain formal principles concerning the use of granted state property and left the matter to be regulated not by royal degrees but by tradition, such sources of income were ultimately used for the establishment of institutions for public welfare. The tradition also originated from the social and political implications of being the founder of a vakıf for an official.

---

[9]M. Akdağ, Türkiye'nin İktisadi ve İçtimai Tarihi, II, pp. 317-318

[10]Ö.L. Barkan, 'Osm. Imp.'da Toprak Vakıfların ....., pp. 19-21

[11]Ibid., p. 23

The members of Ottoman ruling group who instituted a pious foundation had not only religious and charitable purposes in mind but more than these, political ones. When more or less high ranking member of the Ottoman administration took the responsibility for the construction of commercial installations, the aim was generally to provide income for a pious foundation, which by definition could be excepted to make a profit. Under these circumstances, commercial installations which produce no income were not just a bad investment, they were a political failure.[12] Establishment of a vakıf was also a political investment for the founder institutionalized by the very functional reasons within the state.

The central institutions of the state, the standing army and the bureaucracy, emerged as extensions the ruler's household, serving the sovereign while administring his realm. The state allocated revenues for officials who were identified with the state not only for their own necessities but also so that they could maintain extensive households and numerous retainers to better serve the sovereign.[13] Ottoman officials were seen to share in the political authority of the sultan, or at least to represent it in the realm. With this political conception in mind, Barkan has argued that the vakıf established by sultans and by high level officials should indeed be considered state institutions, for they were founded by the state through its representatives, funded by state allocations, and providing public services considered among the basic duties of modern state.[14] These officials who were not only servants of the state but a part of it, founded the vakıf institution in the service of state policy to establish Ottoman presence and culture in the frontier areas, and to provide prosperity and Ottoman culture to towns which sometimes they themselves conquered for the glory of the sultan and the state.

---

[12] S. Faroqhi, Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia, Cambridge 1984, p. 24

[13] Metin Kunt, 'The Vakıf as Instrument of Public Policy', International Seminar on Social and Economic Aspects of Muslim Vakıf, p. 1

[14] E.H. Ayverdi and Ö.L. Barkan, İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri,

2.2. The Social Aspects of Vakıf

The objectives of vakıfs were almost innumerable. Apart from specifically religious institutions such as mosques and tekkes, and educational institutions such as medreses, mekteps and libraries, virtually all 'public works' such as roads, pavements, bridges, aqueducts, water conduits, and lighthouses were provided by this private means, as well as such more evidently charitable institutions as hospitals, hostels, houses for widows, kitchens, and laundries. Many vakıfs were founded for the supply of money to the needy; dowries for orphon girls, the payment of their debts for imprisoned debtors, the payment of fees for the release of prisoners. Others were founded for the supply of assistance in kind: clothes for aged villagers, food and clothing for school-children, rice for birds, food and water for animals. Some vakıf again had as their objective the provision of excursions for children in spring-time and burial for the indigent, while still others were founded in aid of the armed forces: the equipments of soldiers, the financing of the constructian and maintenance of fortresses and other fortifications and of ships for the Ottoman fleet.

All such types of foundations were appropriately called hayri vakıfs (foundations for public benefit), the another type called şahsi vakıfs (family foundations) were almost as old as those for the public good. Family foundations while being charitable in keeping with religion, primarily secured the descendants an income for all emergencies and in particular protected the property in times of insecurity from unscrupulous rulers, although in practice they did not always have the desired result.[15] In addition it was a legal means of evading the Kuranic law of inheritance, whether in order to exclude particular heirs or in order to keep the estate intact, when it would be broken up by the application of the law of inheritance. The founder would allocate property in the same way as for other vakıf, but the revenues accruing from it would provide solely for the livelihood of his descendants as long as any remained.[16]

---

[15] Encycl. of Islam, s.v. 'Wakf', p. 1100

[16] Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, p. 168

The statesmen who attained to high office were exceptionally well placed to acquire property, and some of them had every right to own property and so to use it for endowments. However, when the Treasury was in need of revenue, the goverment was tempted, and often succumbed to the temptetation, to confiscate such an offical's property either when he was dismissed or when he died. Therefore, they should assign some of their property to a foundation, after which the goverment would be powerless to sieze it, at least without infringing the sacred law, thus the family vakıf system enabled them to ensure that not only they themselves, but also their descendants, would remain in enjoyment of such revenues as the property so assigned might yield. This device was much resorted to, so much so that it came to be commonly thought that the whole object of family, if not other, vakıf was to prevent the state from seizing the possessions of the well-to-do,[17] whereas in act it was to provide the founder and his descendants with an income, while preventing the latter from dissipating the capital transmitted to them, and at the same time circumventing the rule of the şeriat for the distribution of inheritances.

However, the family vakıf was not the only way to get personal benefit. Thoughout the centuries the administration of public vakıf was taken on as an important asset by the family which might increase its benefit. One of the reasons of such an attitude was that an administrator of a vakıf usually received a considerable part of the vakıf's income. The normal rate was 10-15 per cent, moreover the administrator usually had extensive power to dispose of the residual income after having satisfied all the beneficiaries according to the vakfiye.[18] The founders stipulated that the administration be retained by their family and offspring as long as the family existed on earth. The administrator was able to provide members of his family with various material advantages deriving from the vakıf. One of those benefits was the perpetual lease of the wage's property. Another way to favour the family was to do business with them at a much higher price.

---

[17] H.B. Kunter, 'Türk Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri', Vakıflar Dergisi, 1938, I, p. 105

[18] G. Baer, 'The Waqf as a Prop. for the Social System', Internationa: Seminar on ......, p. 6

Another way to perpetuate the family's benefit from a public vakıf was a provision that only members of the family, or even specific members of the family be appointed to certain posts created by the vakıf. Such stipulations were quite frequent in the Ottoman Empire; for instance, for the fifteenth century the vakıf of Pir Mehmed İlyas in İstanbul, whose founder stipulated that the reader of certain prayers for whose upkeep he provided be his own sons, as a first priority.[19] A considerable number of such cases in the eighteenth century have been recorded by B. Yediyıldız.[20] He found that rather frequently the post of müderris of a medrese was assigned to the founder or his son or a relative of the founder, and after them to the most learned of their offspring generation after generation. In some cases a specific person, a non-relative, would be named as müderris, and the founder restricted the post to the descendants of that person. If somebody else usurps one of these post or is appointed by the sultan or the kadı, it would be against the founder's will, and he calls dawn upon God's punishment.

The material benefit was not the only advantage to be obtained from the administration of a vakıf. At least as important was the social position and influence adherent to it. A vakıf for public purposes had the result that smaller and larger groups of religious functionaires, Sufis and dervishes, teacher, students and pupils, people who read part of the Kuran or prayed for the founder, servants of all kinds, and people who benefited from public services supplied by the vakıf, became dependant upon the person who distributed the benefits accruing to these groups. If a vakıf was managed by a specific family, the influence of this family upon the beneficiaries would persist as long as members of the family continued to manage it, involving, perhaps, according to the size of the vakıf, larger social and political implications.

---

[19]Ayverdi and Barkan, İst. Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri, p. 314. no. 1832

[20]B. Yediyıldız, 'Müessese Toplum Münasebetleri Çerçevesinde XVIII. Asır Türk Toplumu ve Vakıf', Vakıflar Dergisi, XVII, pp. 5-43

Some of the founders were not satisfied with appointing a member of the family as administrator and leaving the rest to him, but wanted to make sure that in fact the vakıf would be used for this purpose. In order to achieve this aim, they assigned the vakıf's income for the expenditure of the family's guest house, in consideration of the social norm that the more guests a family can entertain the greater its influence and prestige will be. In the early periods of the Ottoman Empire vakıfs for guest houses were established by the sultans and high officials or, in the course of the expansion of the empire, by the colonizing dervişhes for their zaviyes which served as guest houses for the poor and travellers. In later periods, however, one comes across some vakıfs for family guest houses.

Next to the family, the social group most frequently provided for by the founders of vakıf from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century was the group of freed slaves. Slaves played an important and prominant role in the Ottoman Empire, in the military and the civilian administration, as well as in domestic life. Between a slave and master, whom he served for many years a band of patronage persisted. A former slave might remain attached to his emancipator even after his manumission. Since Islamic law had not granted the freedman the right to inheret the property of the patron, even if he died without heirs, the prominent way found to secure his subsistence was by means of a vakıf. Like members of the family, freed slaves were provided for in vakıf deeds by three different methods: as direct beneficiaries, by being assigned specific post in the institutions established by the founder, as administrators. The principal kind of direct benefits of freed slaves from vakıf provisions was the allocation of the income and use of house or just the right to live in them. Vakıf deeds published by Barkan and Ayverdi shows that in sixteenth century İstanbul practically all had provisions for direct benefits of freed slaves in these vakıfs, either in the form of allocation of income or the use of houses.[21] Besides, many vakıfs included other direct provisions in favour of freedmen.[22] Some founders also tried to use

---

[21]Ayverdi and Barkan, İst. Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri, pp. XXV-XXVII

[22]Vakıflar Dergisi, vol. 10 pp. 173 (Osman Ağa, 1793); 340 (Sinan Paşa, 1524-5); vol. 11, pp. 60 (Mehmet Ağa, 1814); 65 (Mehmet Ağa, 1817)

their vakıf in order to perpetuate the connection between the freed
slaves and their family, even after their own death. This they did by
means of stipulations which were trying together the benefits of their
offspring and of the feed slaves.

The two fold nature of the vakıf as either a general charitable
institution for the benefit of the wider Muslim community or some deserving
part there of, or as an endowment for the specific benefit of the donor's
own kin, seem to go back to the beginning of its history in Islam.
The early and distinctive aspect of the vakıf as a family trust which
can to be designated by later jurists was considered completely consistent
with the Muslim Conception of charity by the Islam interpreters. It has
been traced the institution of vakıf to the Prophet although there is no
evidence of this in Kuran. "According to a tradition of Ibn Omar, as
which the legists lay chief stress, Omar later câliph, at the protition
of Khaibar acquired lands which were valuable to him and asked the
Prophet whether he should give them away as sadaka. The Prophet replied:
'Retain the thing itself and devote its fruits to pious purposes'. Omar
did this with the provision that the land should neither be sold nor
bequeathed; he gave it sadaka for the poor, relatives, slaves, wonderers,
guests and for the propagation of the faith; it is not to be a sin for
the administrator to eat of it in moderation or feed a friend if he does
not enrich himself from it".[23] So tradition provides the justification
for the founder and by extension his heirs to enjoy benefit from the vakıf.

The conviction that 'charity begins at home' was never limited
to the purely family vakıf or even to the mixed version of vakıf which
included both family members and the needy members of the community
among its beneficiaries. The general charitable endowment was also frequently
a source of benefaction to the founder and his posterity. The same tradition
by the somewhat forced analogy gives vindication with an incident in which
the Prophet permitted a man to side a beast that the latter had dedicated
for sacrifice instead of leading it along. The principle was established
early on that the administrators of evkaf -and those could be the founder
and his kin- were entitled to eat from the fruits with moderation.

---

[23] Encyc. of Islam, 'Waqf' p. 1097

In the ideology of vakıf as it was formulated in later centuries
when the institution was fully developed, the notion of qurba ('nearness
to God' brought about by a pious act) became the essential element for
its raison d'etre. Thus the vakıf is a permanent endowment set up with
property the income from which is to be used for charitable purposes.
According to the legal opinion in the Islamic world, the property is a
gift to God, absolute and irrevocable, its purpose the benefit of mankind.
The relation of the institution of vakıf to the ideology of charity in
the traditional Muslim world and its role as a vehicle for social welfare
in its Islamic context was not differentiated. Even where ruler and
member of the governing elite provided services for the common wealth,
their acts were not considered acts of individual philanthrophy, not
goverment services.

There can be no doubt that one of the principal original aims
of the vakıf, if not the principal one, was to stregthen the Muslim
community. Throughout the centuries various other social units acquired
importance among the objects to be supported by the vakıf, but the
community of Muslims retained approminant part.[24] First, poor Muslims
(fukara al_Muslimin) figure among the most frequent ultimate beneficiaries
of all kinds of vakıfs, whatever their immediate and intermediate purposes
may be. It was also usual to see provisions for the poor of the town
in deeds, sometimes with the explicit stipulation that the recipients
should be the Muslim poor of the town. Another favourite ultimate
beneficiary are the sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina (Haramayn vakıfları)
which of course symbolize the community of Muslims. Not only Muslims, but
members of other religious communities too used the vakıf to support
their community and its institutions.

Within the community of Muslim, various sub-division -the different
schools of law or the Sufi tarikats- were relevant to the foundation
of vakıfs. Part of them do not seem to have been controlled or inhabited
by distinctive tarikats and in fact most of the zaviyes and tarikats
mentioned in the 1546 register of İstanbul vakıfs are not recorded as

---

[24]G. Baer, 'The Waqf as a Prop for the Social System', International
Seminar on ..., p. 25

belonging to a specific tarikat. Many others, however, definitely were connected with particular tarikats. The dergah or central monastry of the Bektaşi order of dervishes in Anatolia is one of the occasions of vakıf in favour of convents. (25) The Hacı Bektaş itself and were all situated in the vicinity of the tekke. The tekke had a yearly income from vakıfs amounting to 99,000 akçes and mütevelli of the was taken from among the descendants of Hacı Bektaş.

Finally, vakıfs also served to support ethnic or national groups. In the eighteenth century, a kadı in Aleppo, Ahmed Efendi, had established and endowed the medrese al-Ahmadiyya in that city. In his vakfiye, he stipulated the employment of Kurds in the medrese, which has been explained by the probability of Kurdish origin of the family.[26] Many founders in hayri vakıfs in Egypt in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were Turks who designed the Turkish army or some other Turkish institutions as beneficiaries of their vakıfs. Vakfiyes for Turkish national and military purposes has been collected in an article published in Vakıflar Dergisi.[27] In fact, they could not be considered nationalistic in the real sense of the word, some of them aimed at strengtening the military power of the Islamic Ottoman state, or some in favour of public services. When the nationalism is interpreted in the network of modern states, this was the time in which the vakıf system was abolished together or nationalized as in Turkey case.

2.3. The Organization of Vakıf

a. Vakıf Formation

A religious endowment was established by the voluntary act of a private individual, and was registered and validated in the city's seriat court before the kadı or one of his deputies. It entailed the permanent dedication of property for the benefit of some permitted good cause designated by the founder. By so doing, the donor relinquished his power to dispose of the property. Its title became inalienable, and hence forth it could not be bought, sold, inherited or granted as a gift.

---

[25] Ibid., p. 27

[26] Ibid., p. 29

[27] H.B. Kunter, 'Türk Vakıflarının Milliyetçilik Cephesi'. Vakıflar Dergisi. vol III. 1956. pp. 1-13

For the establishment of a vakıf, the founder must have full right
of disposal over his property; he must therefore, be in possession of his
pyhsical and mental faculties, be of age and a free man. He must further
have unrestricted ownership in the subject of the endowment. Endowments
by non-Muslims are therefore only valid if they intended for a purpose not
incompatible with Islam.[28] The object of the endowment must be of a
permanent nature and yield a usufruct, so that it is primarily real estate.

As already explained in the preeceding pages, two kind of vakıfs
are distinguished; hayri vakıf, endowments of a definitely religious or
public nature and family endowments, for children or grand-children or
other relations or for other persons. In every kind the ultimate purpose
of a foundation must be a work pleasing to God. The formal unity of both
types lay in the requirement that the ultimate purpose of the family
endowment be some charitable cause, that the revenue revert to a benefical
institution after the decease of all the individuals designated as
beneficiaries by the founder. Some vakıfs, indeed, mixed elements of both,
assigning the revenue in some chosen proportions to family members and
to a pious cause.

The founder must clearly express his wishes either by vakfiye or
of he was other formulate by an addition that 'it must neither be sold
not given away nor bequeathed', phrase always occuring in vakıf documents'
otherwise it would only be a sadaka.[29] The founder must further describe
the object accurately and state exactly for what purpose and in whose favour
the endowment is made. The fıkıh works deal very fully with the interpretation
of the seperate expressions describing those for whom the foundation is
intended.

Vakıf enables the founder to determine the fate of his property
during his lifetime and after his death. So in many vakfiyes confirmed by
courts the founder makes dedication 'in his own favour for the duration
of his life'.[30] Even where the dedication is made for public purposes,
it is sometimes stipulated that the founder alone shall enjoy the income
of the vakıf as long as he lives. The beneficiaries of vakıf would be

---

[28]Encyc. Of Islam, s.v. 'Wakf', p. 1096

[29]Ibid., p. 1097

[30]Aharon Layish, 'The Family Wagf and the Shar'i Law of Succession
According to Wakfiyyet in the Sijill of Shariat Courts', International Sem.
.... p. 9

the wife, the existing children of the founder and also those who may be born in the future. In some cases, persons dedicated their property to relatives and to poor family members, of different classes and degrees in relation to the founder as beneficiaries. These are the characteristics of family vakıf which is mainly used as a means to circumvent the Muslim law of succession.

Family vakıfs were concerned about the position and welfare of their own family and offspring, however the family and the offspring could overvelmingly predominate in some vakıfs where their income was assigned for only religious and charitable purposes. At this point, we may accept that members of the Ottoman ruling group who institutied a pious foundation had not only religious and charitable purposes in mind, but political ones as well. "Even where other wordly aims were professed with all sincerity, certain donors may have aimed at establishing a local power-base through the patronage and employment that a major pious foundation could offer. Others may have attracted by the relative freedom from goverment interference that the Ottoman administration was prepared to grant well-run institutions of this type."[31] The position of donors in the social stratification of the Ottoman society had not much changed in time. The most detailed information on this subject involves to the eighteenth century. B. Yediyıldız states that the 80-90 per cent of the vakıf founders pertained to the military class.

> "Sultan and his family formed eleven per cen of vakıf founders. Among these families and the other ruling groups, the most remarkable ones were 'valide sultans' and cariyes of the palace and especially aghas of darüssüade who occupied the third level in the hierarchical order until the fall of Abdülhamid II. The group of civil servants constituted the second level in the administrative social and econmical hierarchy and formed thirty two per cent of all vakıf founders. The head of this group, grand vezirs, amounted to five per cent in the eighteenth century. In this group, kethüda-i sadrazam as the minister of internal affairs, reisülküttab as the financial minister, agha of Janissary as one of the most powerful personalities in the state and the provincial administrators followed grand vezir hierarchiecally. The fifteen per cent of vakıfs belonged to the ulema. Ulema consisted of şeyhülislam as the first authority, kadıs, kadıasker, müftü and müderris."[32]

---

[31]S. Faroqhi, Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia, p. 24

[32]B. Yediyıldız, 'Türk Vakıf Kurucularının Sosyal Tabakalaşmadaki Yeri' The Journal of Ottoman Studies, III

On the other side of official group, dervishes belonged to the
tarikats of Nakşibendiye, Bektaşiye, Kadiriye, Halvetiye and Celvetiye
consisted the 6 per cent of the founders. Dervishes were closer to reaya
than ulema and tried to join the religious principles with daily life.
The lower rates of the reaya, tax payers, in the founders might be axplained
by their inability to accumulate surplus and to have property. The
merchant generally prefered to use vakıfs as the source of cash instead
to invest the capital. This way was a pervasive credit mechanism so
cash money made up a part or the whole of the funds for money vakıfs and
its interest used as income. Ayan and craftsmen as the founders had lower
rates, each formed the 2 per cent of the founders in the eighteenth
century.

b. The Administration of Vakıf

In the vakfıyes, or deeds, of both types of foundation, beneficial
and family, the properties, the revenues from which were to maintain them
and all the persons appointed to administer and serve them, together
with their emoluments, were minutely particularized.[33] The first administrator
is usually appointed by the founder; frequently he is the founder himself.
All evkaf had two persons designated to assure their execution in
perpetuity; an administrator, called mütevelli, whose appoinment was called
tewliya, and a supervisor, called nazır.

The persons appointed as Nazırs were usually important goverment
servants or religious dignitaries, since it was necessary feature of
the arrangement that in conrast to the mütevelli, who were more often
than not descendants of the founder. The Nazirs should be in a position to
control the actions of the mütevelli and, if the family died out, to
choose suitable persons as their successors. He had the right to relieve
anyone of his position for non-performance of duties and could make new
appoinments without the interference of the courts. The nazır administered
the vakıf was assisted by a treasurer (cabi) and a secretary (katib).
By the terms of vakfiya, the mütevelli, nazır, katib and cabi received
fixed rations of food and montly salaries.

---

[33]Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, p. 170

The founder of a vakıf, who was called the vâkıf, was free to appoint anyone he wished as mütevelli. The mütevelli of imperial foundations, as well as their nazırs, were usually goverment servants. As regards ordinary vakıfs, it was quite in order for a vakıf-founder to appoint himself mütevelli, providing for the tawliya (tevliye) to pass on his death to his descendants, and if in such a case his family died out, since it fell to the nazır to choose a mütevelli. On the other hand, the vakıf might from the first leave it to the nazır to appoint a mütevelli should have another occupation: mosque ministers were in fact often chosen. The mütevelli was in all cases obliged to render a yearly account of his stewardship to the nazır.[34]

The administrative system of evkaf in the Ottoman state had some common continued principles from the times of Ilkhanids, Anatolian Seljuk, and Principalities as the appoinment of viziers to the ruler's vakıfs as mütevelli or nazır, the supervision of the kadı's organization on specially private vakıfs or the engagement of superviziors for some regions.[35] Sultan Mehmed II (1451-1481), Selim I (1512-1520) and Süleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566) appointed the Grand Vezir to be Nazır of the evkaf of their mosques; whereas Beyazıd II (1481-1512) and Ahmed I (1603-1617) appointed the Şeyhu'l-Islam. If there was not remained any mütevelli or nazır according to the stipulations of the founder in the vizier and high official vakıfs (vüzera ve rical vakıfları), these post would be assigned to the statesmen traditionally as a kindness.

> "Many vakıf institutions gave the administrative work--as mütevelli-
> to the heirs and the supervision work -nazır-- to the major
> statesmen like sadrazam, şeyhülislam, aga of darüşşüade according
> to their vakıfname. Every vakıf institution has a supervisor who
> examined the vakıf accounts and informed nazır about the complaints
> of the related people against the mütevelli after a careful
> investigation. The supervision by the kadıs was not possible for
> the vakıfs which were administered by the powerful nazırs. If
> there had been no heirs left, the appointment and the dismissal
> of mütevellis of such vakıfs were carried out directly by these
> nazırs."[36]

---

[34] Ibid., p. 172

[35] F. Köprülü, 'Vakıf Müessesesinin Hukuki Mahiyeti ve Tarihi Tekamülü, Vakıflar Dergisi, 1938, p. 22

[36] Ibid., p. 23 and Netayic-ül-Vukuat, vol. IV, p. 99

In later times, however, the supervision of nearly all mosque foundations, imperial and private, was confided to the Kızlar Ağası because of the intimate association of those eunuchs with the sultan themselves.[37] Despite the fact that neither Nazırs nor Mütevellis were supposed to draw any emoluments from vakıf funds except small fees known as 'boot-price' (Çizme pahası), the supervision of these foundation was extremely profitable to the Kızlar Ağası. By the eighteenth century they were responsible for the evkaf of as many as five hundred mosques alone and to consider the affairs of these institutions and others used to preside over weekly meetings of the mütevelli concerned at what was called Harameyn Divanı since the Kızlar Ağasıs were then also Nazırs of all evkaf of the Holy Cities. But under Mustafa III (1754-74), the sultan reigning, the grand vezir Ragıp Paşa virtually deprived the Kızlar Ağasıs of their authority in this sphere by placing responsibility for the collection of these vakıf revenues, which had long been affected by tax-farm, in the hands of the Defterdars, at the same time dismissing many unsuitable persons who had been appointed as Mütevellis; result was the swift increase in the revenues.[38]

It is possible to increase the instances of maladministration of the evkaf especially after the seventeenth century parallel to the decline of the empire. It has been claimed that one of the reasons of this maladministration was the granting of vakıf's tawliyas to such unsuitable persons as Sipahis of the standing army.[39] The characteristic feature of the imperial vakıf was the administrative and functional integration with the goverment elite; so the transformation of the social and economic structure of the state was inevitably reflected in the internal organization and social activities of vakıf. This period was also the beginning of economic problems for vakıfs; the restriction of revenues, the collection of some taxes exempted before and increasing needs for repairness. In the side of private vakıfs, there was keen competition for the control of large number of vakıfs held by the officers, with all the resulting intrigues, bribery and other abuses.

---

[37]Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, p. 170

[38]Ibid., p. 171

[39]Ibid., p. 172

The establishment of evkaf ministry (Evkaf'ı Hümayun Nezareti 1826) was an attempt to centralize the control mechanism on vakıfs and to increase the state revenue at the same time. Up to that time, the network of vakıfs, by its organization and practice, was based on personalistic relations in the empire, governed not by royal decrees but by tradition.

III. URBAN SOCIETY AND VAKIF

In the Ottoman society, the town was regarded as a religious and administrative center. The Ottoman sultans had always appointed two authorities to administer a district-the bey who came from the military class and represented the sultan's executive authority and the kadı, who came from the ulema and represented the sultan's legal authority. Apart from the fact that higher ranking administrative officials and ulema considered the upper echelons of urban society, the tradiation of a town consisted partly of the reputation which its schools and ulema managed to gain in the surrounding provinces. The Ottomans also considered the town as the place where "cuma kılınır ve bazarı durur".[1] All the settlements in which han, haman, bedestan and kervansaray constructed were town in the Ottoman law. The approach to the concept of town stresses upon a focus of dynamism for the urban environment and emphasized a highly urbanized structure for the system.

In the traditional near eastern empire, the state undertook public works such as the building and maintenance of canals, dikes, roads, bridges and kervansarays, since the promotion of trade and agriculture would enrich the ruler's Treasury. In the Islamic period the idea of public works as a pious or charitable act supplanted this tradition and thus, even when undertaken by a sovereign, they came to be regarded as independent institutions outside the realm of state activities.[2] The process of establishment and operation of a vakıf foundation defined the manner of its independence which stemmed from not an absolute autonomy but the public nature of the institution. Revenues necessary for the investments came from the state, most of the founders were statesmen, a control mechanism, in different degrees was being in force, nevertheless in this framework the vakıf system was internally autonomous and integrated with the urban society.

---

[1]Ö. Ergenç, 'Osmanlı Şehrinde Yönetim Kurumlarının Niteliği Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler', VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, p. 1268

[2]H. İnalçık, The Ottoman Empire, p. 140

Beginning from the foundation stage, legal pecularities of a vakıf was determined for the capability of public side. The act of endowment put the property to special and economic uses which were of wide public significance. The intricate code of law which governed the operation of the foundation reflected a recognition of the public nature of the institution. It defined the required moral qualities and the various duities and obligations of the foundation administrator, mütevelli, as though he were a public servant. Moreover, it bestowed on the kadı some important discretionary powers which enabled him to overrule even the founder's own wishes and the inalienability of the property when this served the general interests of the foundation and the urban community.

The most important aspect of the vakıf system for towns was the construction of imarets which provided the city with public services and markets. The urban complex was completely integrated into the life and setting of the quarter surrounding it. Depending on the nature of imaret complexes, their size and scope varied. A fully developed one, included the following units [3]: cami, medrese (a theological school), bimarhane or daruşşifa (a hospital which could be combined with a tımarhane or lunatic asylum), aşevi (soup kitchen), tabhane (hospice where travellers might lodge free for three days), kervansaray (continuity of tabhane, hospice for animals) sibyan mektep (Kuran school for small boys), kütüphane (library), muvakkithane (time keepers' room also used by astrologers), hanikah or kalenderhane (named as tekke in later times, lodging for itinerant dervishes, not necessary for külliye), türbe (tomb or mausoleum), imalathaneler (mills), arasta and kapalıçarşılar (covered market), hans, water installations, dwellings, toilets and fountains.

The vakfiye states the various properties belonging to the foundation to finance the operation of the complex. The properties which may be acquired through purchase, exchange and the relinquishing of rights by the founder included state land and private property. Business premises were most frequently made vakıf, usually smal shops which belonged to a vakıf but also warehouses, or even smaller dwellings and

---

[3] O.N. Ergin, Türk Şehirlerinde İmaret Sistemi, 1939, p. 22

tenements. Alongside of these they had various industrial premises; baths, mills bakeries, oil and sugar presses, soop works, paper works, loom. In addition to orchards, vineyards and gardens on the city's outskrits they included fields, mills and villages in the countryside.[4] To protect property that constituted the vakıf and also to defend the rights of beneficiaries, it was generally required that vakıf property could only be exchanged for property of similar value and having equal permanence.

The activities of the imaret sections, the number and duties of staff as the stipulations and properties, were determined in the vakfiyes. The vakfiyes carefully list the exact stipents of religious men, teachers and students, the şeyhs and the students of the takiyah, the reciters of the Kuran and service personnel of the collegiate mosque. The administrative staff of a vakıf have their salaries recorded on the pages of vakfiye. The main personnel charged with a duty in an urban complex was listed as the following:[5] Hatip (preacher), imam (prayer leader), müezzin (friday servant), vaiz (one who admonishes), religious duities-reisülhuffaz, hafız, devirhan, yasinhan, cüzhan, ihlashan, salavat han, naithan, mevlidhan (people who recites sure in the thirteenth part of the Kuran at the specific time and places accordingto the stipulations in the vakfiye), akşam müezzini (friday noon servant), kayyim (caretaker of mosque), ferraş (mosque sweeper), musalli (engaged in worship, who says his prayers regularly), müsebbih (who recites litanies), duagu (an official of a mosque especially appointed to recite prayers), muarrif (person who mentioned in tanksgiving the names of benevolent people just before the Friday noon prayer in a mosque, master of ceremonies), muvakkit (time-keeper), noktacı (supervisor of duties), sıracı (oil-lamp cleaner), hasıri (mat maker), Kandili (oil-lamp lighters), bevvap (doormen), pashan (watchman), türbedar (keeper of a mausoleum), destari (maker of turbans), müderris (professorship in the hierarchy of ulema), muit (tutor, supervisor in a school), danişmend (learned man), muallim (teacher), şeyh, nazır, mesnevihan, şiirhan, semazen (people who recites in tekkes and zaviyes), hafızı kütüp (librarian), katibi kütüp (librarian secretary), reysületibba (head doctor), tabip (doctor),

[4]Encyc. of Islam, 'Wakf', pp. 1096-1103 and D. Crerelius, 'The Waqf of Muhammed Bey Abû-al-Dhahap in Historical Perspective', International Seminar ..

[5]H.B. Kunter, 'Türk Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri', Vakıflar Dergisi 1938, vol. I, pp. 13-17

cerrah (surgeon), kehbal (ophthalmologist), tabbahi ilaç (pharmacist), emini sarf (manager), vekiliharc, emini mahzen, kilardar (people who employs in supply office), tabbah (cook), merza hadimi (hospital attendant), imaret şeyhi, imaret nakibi (assistant of şeyh), habbaz (baker), hammali gûşt (meat porter), nakkadi kendim (wheat cleaner), kâseşu (dish washer), kasekeş (waiter), ahuri (guard of animals for guest), arpa emini (supplier of animals' food), hammali hatap (firewood porter of imaret), kandüm gûp (person who hammers wheat), nakkadi erz (rice cleaner), aşşap (collector of roots, flowers, and grass for darüşşifa), kennasi halâ (sweaper of toilets), mutahhiri hala (cleaner of toilets), abrizi (dealer in ready-made goods), harisi bedestan (guard of bedestan), hafızı tas (guard of water cups in fountains), abkeş (water drawer), gümrük memuru (customs official), ...
Staff in vakıf administration were; nazır, mütevelli, assistant of mütevelli, katip, cabi, sanduki (cashier), kaidülma (water engineer), suyolcu (man who organizes and repairs water installations), mimar (architect), meremetci (repairman), üsrübi (maker or of dealer in bullets), maniinnukuş (defender of architectural monuments), mahyaci (man who lights strung between minarets during Ramazan to form words or pictures), mücellid bookbinder), bahçıvan (gardener), mühürdar (keeper of the seals).

In the years between 1530-40, the seventeen percent of the state revenue collected from the province of Anatolia (including the subdivision of the province; Kastamonu, Alaiye, Teke, Hamid and Karahisar-ı Sahip) was in the hands of vakıfs and assigned for the public, religious and charitable works. The most important part of this revenue was used for the management of 45 imarets, 342 camis, 1055 mescids, 110 medreses, 626 zaviyes and hankahs, 154 muallimhane, 1 kalenderhane, 1 mevlevihane, 2 darülhuffaz, 75 great hans and kervansarays and for the employment of 121 müderris, 3756 katip, imam and müezzin, 3299 şeyh_ şeyh-zade, kayyum, students and mütevelli.[6] In the same years, the rate of vakıf revenues in the total state revenue was fourteen per cent in the province of Karaman Halep and Şam, sixteen per cent in Rum, five per cent in Rumelia.

---

[6] Ö.L. Barkan, 'Osm. İmp.'da İmaret sitelerinin ...', İkt. Fak. Mec. vol. XXIII, 1-2, p. 242

Vakıf institution is of a special interest because the income collected
through their own agencies is at least in parts expended locally and not
drained away to the capital city.[7] In the second half of the sixteenth
century, the Ottoman capital already contained more than half a million
inhabitants and the demand of the city for food, raw material and manufactured
good was so great that it shaped the structure of agricultural production
and craft industries in Anatolia. In the provinces, part of these resources
served to supply public services of religious and secular character, while
the remainder was used to support certain families of religious leaders
who continued to live in the same locality for centuries. So the existence
of vakıfs would sustain the local character of the cities and provide a
relative independence from the capital city in terms of public life and
services.

The daily scene unfolding in the complex represented a kale-
idoscopic range of religious and profane activities. The former spanned
virtually the entire spectrum of religious text to recitation of Kuranic
passages in the thousands. The majority of all vakıf owned shops was located
inside larger foundation complexes. The size of this agglomeration of vakıf
premises might range all the way from about ten shops belonging to a local
mosque to large foundations encompassing hundreds of business premises.
The commercial installations were another aspect of külliye integrated to
religious and charitable ones. Alongside the bimarhane and aşevi, the
complex also provided a comfortable environment in which a variety of workers
could discharge their daily functions. Within its walls the hammering of
the carpenter, the swishing of the custodion's broom, the commands of
the driver of the saqiyah to his oxen, the chatter of the people receiving
water from its fountains and washing at its ablution basin, and the jests
of the residents of the takiyah intermingled with the müezzin's call to
prayer, the lectures given by the şeyhs and the intonation of the
reciters of Kuranic passages.

---

[7] S. Faroqhi, 'Vakıf Administration in the sixteenth century Konya',
Jour. of the Econ. and Soc. His. of Orient', XVII.

In such an urban environment, the concept of citizenship should be considered in terms of urban community and urban life. The term of citizenship which was formed in the framework of autonomous institutions of the European cities could not be taken as a criteria to examine the social cohesion in the Ottoman or Islamic cities. Social structure of the Ottoman Empire defined with ethnic and religious components was not uniform even in a town. The existence of different patterns in social life would bring about a new norm for the urban community: the common life derived from an urban institution, vakıf. The effects of such focus of dynamism, külliye, on social life, both an urban and quarter level should be re-evaluated to understand the limits of urban community.

The town of the founder is mentioned rather frequently in vakfiyes. G. Baer asserted that this was quite natural, since people and institutions of the founder's town were those with which he had been familiar and therefore most of the provisions in favour of people and institutions in the founder's town did not necessarily reflect urban loyalty or solidarity.[8] If the foundation of vakıf is appreciated only as an institution in favour of the founder's families and its public side is neglected, this approach will reduce the significance of vakıfs for the sustenance of the urban social unit. The importance of the vakıf as an institution in the implementation of public policy is revealed in the distribution of constructed sites in the lands of the empire.

Köprülü Mehmed Paşa, one of the most famous vezirs in all of Ottoman history, built many public and charitable works. One of the vakfiyes of Köprülü, dates 1679, was very extensive.[9] In various parts of the empire he built a total of 6 mosques, 1 mescid, 1 bath, 7 schools, 4 hans, 114 shops, 18 mills, a prayer platform (namazgah), a public fountain, a coffe-house, a stable, a bakery, a water-wheel, and a large complex including a fort, a han, a mosque, a school and a mescid. Some of these buildings, namely the shops, the bath-house, the coffee-house, the hans, and the mills generated revenue. All the rest of the revenue for the endowment came from rural sources, again in various parts of the empire:

---

[8] G. Baer, 'Waqf as a prop ...', p. 15

[9] Metin Kunt, 'The Wakıf as an Institution of Public Policy', p. 19

37 villages, 19 uninhabited villages (mezra'a) 4 summer postures, revenues
of two markets (bâc bazar), and 4 estates, all of which were state revenues
granted to the paşa.

Regardless of whether the source of income was dirlik revenue or
revenue from lands granted to individuals or spoils of war in addition to
these grants, the investment of private funds in the creation of a religious,
cultural and social astablishments, and the allocation of special funds
for the future maintenance of this establishment by private individuals,
points out the fact that this was a relatively independant and individualistic
system. However, the state supported the system by an allocation of needed
resources. As long as the state was the unique owner of these resources,
it could not be totally excluded from such an activity. But the remarkable
feature of this system of construction was that, even though a procedure
of state assignment provided the initial funds required for the creation
of vakıf, the initative itself came from the individual founder who
enjoyed the right of using the funds from such a source as he liked.

This kind of procedure would be interpreted as the state's
transfer of an enterprise normally undertaken by the state to an individual,
because the necessary financial resources were to a large extent provided
by the state. But on the other hand, when assignments were made to
individuals, there was no royal decree or legal document forcing the
beneficiary to use the resources for the foundation of a vakıf. The vakıf
system also could not be explained only as a way of evading the law of
inheritance or confiscation. The fact that some individuals received
important grants from the state, which combined with such factors as
individual initative and the community's belief and ideals, give rise to
the foundation of these institutions and the creation of a number of most
remarkable public works.Traditionally, the activity was the expression
of the individual's contribution to his community.

There was a determinative fact that vakıf was an important
source for achieving social prestige and high status. The vakıf offered
men of means who wished to gain in prestige an established framework through
which they could achieve this by invesment of various kinds, particularly
social ones. The importance of the vakıf is due to the fact that there were
no other established frameworks besides this which offered the achievement
of prestige and the ability to perpetuate one's name through the construction
and financing of enterprises for the public welfare. The quest for
prestige was one of the main factors for investment within the vakıf

framework and that it is doubtful whether these foundations would have
been made if this framework not existed.

3.1. Urban Economy and Vakıf

Before trying to determine the influence of vakıfs on the urban
economy, it is necessary to define the general pattern of relationship
between the vakıf institution and economy process in the Islamic society.
Because the existing researches on the subject are far from having the
quality to specify the causes and effects in the economic history of
vakıfs, I will try to speculate on the effects of the vakıf on an urban
economy. It would seem that the question is of a central importance at
least from the wide range of assets, lands, buildings, facilities, equipment,
cash, etc. endowed as vakıf their uses as well as from the substantial incomes
derived from these assets, within the framework of this institution.

For their functioning, urban institutions depended directly or
indirectly upon sums of money that had been collected as taxes, in an
economy in which the vast majority of producers were peasants or nomads,
urban settlements could not survive without a flow of taxes from the
countryside.[10] Increase in cultivated land area played a central role in
the growth process of urban economy. The vakıf contributed to and
encouraged the reclamation or re-cultivation of land by endowed wide areas
of estates and villages. In agriculture, the vakıf financed the construction
of open irrigation canals, purchasing of irrigation facilities, construction
of dams, construction of warehouses for agricultural produce, purchase
of tools, planting of orchard and vineyards, increase and betterment of
cattle and sheep herds, etc.

When the vakıf is considered from the view point of the extensive
enterprises to which it gave rise, it is seen to occupy a special place
in the question of capital formation in Muslim society. The object of the
Muslim vakıf is to establish a charitable foundation, but the essence
of the vakıf is a thing 'restrained' to God which produces an income,

---

[10]S. Faroqhi, 'Urban Development in Ottoman Anatolia 16-17.
centuries; METU Journal of the Fac. of Arc., XVII, 1

the income being expanded upon the defined charitable purposes. The vakıf
therefore is an institution closely related to an impersonal and perpetual
fund of capital.[11] Since the existence of the vakıf was bound up with the
preservation of the source of income, the administrators of the vakıf
concentrated their activity upon the protection and increase of the capital,
many endovers of vakıf laid it down as a duty of the administrators to
increase the income and extend the vakıf. The founder played the role of
an enterpreneur setting up the project, investing the capital for the
profit bringing establishments usually bringing the land and slave together
and disposing the income.[12]

A great number of founder of vakıf invested their capital partly
or totaly in erecting buildings in the cities, such as baths, bazars,
shops, workshops, bakeries, oil tresses, mills, slaughter houses, tanneries
etc. These were believed to be the ideal vakıfs, for they were long
enduring and secured a steady rent. The vakıf financed with this revenue
the establishments of mosques and zaviyes, medreses, orphonages and soup
kitchens, hospitals, and many additional facilities whose purpose was to
extend the social service system. The significance of these investments
is not only in their aggregate size in absolute terms, but rather in their
relative share in the total capital formation. It seems that up to the
beginning of the nineteenth century the substantial part of the social
capital formation was financed by the vakıf. In the nineteenth century
during which the central and provincial authorities in most of the
Islamic states, as well as foreigners from western countries, invested
directly in social services, the vakıf continued to fulfill an important
role in the formation of social capital assets, though there was a decrease
in its relative share, and hence a decrease in its significance.[13]

The system in which vakıf transcations operated in practice
was highly pragmatic and responsive to daily demands. The founders of
vakıf were free to set down specific conditions regarding the management
of the endowed property and its administration. The kadı as overseer of
the vakıfs could authorize deviations from then when this appeared to

[11]H. İnalcık, 'Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire', Jornal of
Economic History, XXIX. pp. 98-140

[12]Ibid., p. 81

[13]G. Gilbar, 'Muslim Waqf and Economic Growth', International Seminer

serve general interest of the foundation. The court, indeed emerges as a
realistic body, aware of the demands of economic life and always willing
to assist the foundation in coping with their financial difficulties.[14]
It was thus greatly responsible for introducing a dynamism and fluidity
into the institution of the vakıf as well as into the city's real estate
market.

The leasing of property was the vakıf's major activity. Leasing,
unlike outright sale, created a continuing relationship between vakıf and
tenant. The terms of this relationship as spelled out in the written leases
followed diverse patterns. The duration of the tenancy, for example
varied widely from case to case though generally ranging from one to
three years. The stipulation in the law, and in many vakıf deeds, that urban
real estate not be leased for more than one year at a time was later
circumvented. It was common for vakıfs to request the courts to free them
from this limitation, on the grounds that the tenant was ready to pre-pay
the rent and thus provide funds urgently needed for the repair of property.[15]

Mukataa (hikr) was one of the various forms of long-term lease of
vakıf property. In return for an annual ground rent (hikr) the tenant
enjoyed full ownership rights over all the buildings and improvement which
he added to the land belonged to vakıf. Originally the aim of these
contracts was to give tenants an incentive to maintain and ameliorate
dilapidated vakıf properties, which are inalianable. In exchange the
tenant is granted priority of lease, the right of permanent lease of the
usufruct of the property or even co-proprietorship with the vakıf.[16] The
tenant may erect buildings or plant trees which became his full private
property. He is entitled to transfer and sell the property and the right
of perpetual lease to any other person and they are inherited according to
the şeriat. It is important to note that hikr contract were made predominantly
on public (hayri) vakıf whose income was dedicated to hospitals, mosques,
the poor, etc.

---

[14]A. Marcus, 'Piety and Profit: The Waqf in the Soc. and Econ. of
the 18th century Aleppo', International Seminar..., p.28

[15]Ibid., p. 29

[16]G. Baer, 'Hikr', Encyc. of Islam, p.1

A special type of long-term lease was icareteyn. According to
the lease terms, the tenant has got the usufruct right as long as he lived,
when he died the right passed to his heirs.[17] Vakıf administrator got a
lump sum payment near to the real value of the property named icare-i muaccele
at the conclusion of the agreement, and a fixed rent annualy named icare-i
müeccele. Long leases were often imposed on vakıfs by financial difficulties.
This type of arrangement was common in Anatolia and in all countries
formerly part of the empire apperantly since the sixteenth and seventeenth
century.[18] The recording fires in İstanbul and other Anatolian towns have
been considered as a primary reason for the spreading icareteyn contracts.
It served a usuful expedient to develop deteriorated vakıf estates in
periods of economic prosperity.

Given the inability of many vakıf to invest in rebuilding the
deteriorated parcels, leasing them was the best alternative. If these
arrangements were of little profit to the foundations they were nevertheless
of positive value to the market as a whole. Land that was virtually dead
was re-circulated and exposed to the benefits of outside capital. On the
other side, step leases providing for rent changes at various time intervals
were not used even when the duration of the tenancy was quite extensive.
Some leases provided for the payment of the rent at a regular time
intervals. For houses and shops rent was usually paid montly; in the case of
bath-houses however, the rent was calculated on a daily basis.[19] This
peculiar arrangement was design to facilitate reductions in the rent for
days in which the hamam could not operate owning to holidays or cuts
in water supply.

Other types of arrangement for payment were quite as frequent.
One of the cases, rent was fully paid in advance; the foundations'
justification was almost invariably the need for immediate funds for repair
or for the payment of depts. At times, the vakıf collected a bulk of rent
in advance, leaving a certain sum with the tenant to cover expenses for
repairs and taxes.[20] It was normal practice to permit the tenants to invest

---

[17]N. Öztürk, Menşei ve Tarihi Gelişimi İçinde Vakıflar, p. 108

[18]G. Baer, 'Hikr', p.4

[19]A. Marcus, 'Piety and Profit: The Waqf in the Soc. and Econ. of
the 18th century Aleppo', International Seminar ..., p. 31

[20]Ibid., p. 32

in any necessary repairs. They were often reimbursed for such outlays by
means of reductions in rents or by a total exemption from payment when
leases were extended. The terms of conditions of the leases reflected
the financial problems of some vakıfs. The perpetual conflict between
the needs of the beneficiaries and the demand of adequate maintenance
impact on the leasing transactions.

The leasing practices of the foundation had far reaching effects
on rental values in the market. Long term leases at inchanging rental
rates meant that rents remained at a stable level, largely uneffected by
short term fluctuations. More over, to the extent that the lease provisions
imposed on the tenant extraordinary financial responsibilities, he would
have sought an offset in the form of reduced payments. So vakıf administrators
often displayed a clear awareness of market prices and were quick to
exploit changing circumstances. Another important operation of the vakıfs
was investment in the construction and rehabilitation of real estate.
The foundations were constantly spending on the maintenance of their houses,
shops and other properties. Although some repairs were covered by vakıf
funds and thus not came up to the courts for any special action, the
large-scale reconstruction operations posed totally different problems,
and involved the vakıf in interesting arrangements. For instance, when a
foundation was short of funds to cover urgent repairs, its administrator
would receive the kadı's permission to borrow the necessary sums. Vakıfs
sometimes found individuals willing to invest in the reconstruction in
return for share in the rent or the right to use property. The dynamic
structure of the vakıfs could be observed in such and similar ingenious
methods which were devised by administrators for inviting outside capital
for repairs or construction.

Another method used rather frequently by vakıfs to revive their
sources of income was the exchange (istibdal-değişme) of endowed real estate
which had lost its productivity with more productive private properties,
cash or a combination of both.[21] Vakıf based their request for the court's
permission to exchange a property on the claim thay it was in need of repair
and that the foundation could find no funds to repair it or a tenant to

---

[21]Ibid., p. 37

rent it. The economic aspects of exchange are particularly interesting. An inspection of the respective property by the court might ascertain the advantages to the vakıf and by the exchange the vakıf would acquire real estate of a higher rental yield and of a superior structure and location. Through the exchange, the investors acquired properties with lower current rental values, but with potentially higher capital values. The essential commercial nature of this method comes out clearly in cases where endowed property was exchanged for cash. The money acquired was to be used by the vakıf the purchase of another property, or to be lent out at interest.

Credit operations offered the foundations were another channel for generating income. There were many cases in which foundations reported in their annual statements the lending of surplus money. These kind of endowment were legitimized on the basis of customary practice, was a prime example of positive law in action within the şeriat in the early fifteenth century by the Ottoman courts and by the end of the sixteenth century they were an extraordinary form in much of Anatolia and Rumelia.[22] In Edirne, a vakıf founded for a children's school consisted of 200.000 akçes.[23] This sum would be put out at interest at ten percent, and the yield would be spent fot the current expenses of the school. The family vakıf of Süleyman Ağa, commander of the Sultan's gardener in Edirne, is interesting. He made a vakıf of one millian akçe cash to bu put out at fifteen percent. The income from the interest was assigned to his wife and offspring. When his race was extinct, the income to be assigned to the building and maintenance of a college for the reader of the Kuran. This type of money vakıfs was quite widespread in the empire. The acceptance of cash vakıf meant the opening of a legally sanctioned and govermentally controlled money market for the small lender and buyer.

---

[22] J. Mandaville, 'Usurious Piety: The Cash Waqf Controversy in the Ottoman Empire', International Journal of Middle East Studies, X, 3, p. 289

[23] The instance is taken from the article of H. İnalcık, 'Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire' Jour. of Econ. His. XXIX p. 134

Having observed the economic operations of the foundation, it is
clear that in spite of the intrinsic limitations and constraints the vakıf
system displayed a great degree of dynamism and flexibility. The picture
that emerge does not define the foundations as close institutions within
economic terms but an enterpretive and integrated with the economic realm
of the urban life. In all, the impact of the institution on the urban
economy and particularly on the real estate market was considerable indeed.
Not less formidable was its effects on the community.

3.2. Urban Organizations/Social Groups and Vakıf

For the urban society, two key organizations were the guilds and
the hierarchical organization of the religious communities.[24] The craft
guilds were the mainspring of economic life in Ottoman cities and guild
members made up a great part of the population. The prevalent kind of
association in Anatolia of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was the
organization of the ahi movement of young men adopted the ideals of futuwwa.[25]
In the cities, each group of craftsmen was organized according to
futuwwa principles, under the leadership of an ahi whom they chose from
their own ranks. Since there was no strongly centralized authority in
Anatolia during this period, the ahis performed a number of public functions
and became a political force in the cities.

However, the changes in the political situation in Anatolia brought
about by the rise of Ottoman power were unfavourable to the existence of
free associations such as ahis. The state brought them more and more under
its own control with the growth of centralism though they remained autonomous
with respect to their internal political affairs. The guild organization,
similar to the vakıfs, was the provider of social and economic services
for the benefit of state and at the same time was a means of public order
in the urban environment. The guild organization involved to control the

---

[24]F. Birtek and Schimtter, 'Historical and Contemporary Determinants
of Urban Performance in Post-War Mediteeranean Europe', an unpublished
article, p. 4

[25]G. Baer, 'Guilds in Middle East History', pp. 11-36

economic life of urban society and quarantied the collecting of taxes, the vakıf foundations supplied public services and arranged an important rate of charitable and religious works without any requirement of direct state intervention.

The relationship between the vakıf and guild organizations had many dimensions. First of all, the vakıfs were used to support these professional organizations. There were a number of guild şeyhs among administrators of vakıf. Guild şeyhs appeared as founders of vakıf although existing data are insufficient to evaluate the significance of this fact. İstanbul registers asserted the foundations of such vakıfs in 1522.[26] Üstad Ahmet b. Abdullah, the kethüda (head of the guild) of dyers in İstanbul, founded a vakıf consisting a number of dwelling places most of which he allocated to three of his apprentices and their offspring. Even more significant as an example of the vakıf's support to guilds is a vakfiye from the eighteenth century whose content has been analysed by B. Yediyıldız.[27] According to this document a tent merchant established a vakıf stipulating that a scavenger paid by his vakıf be appointed to sweep the street in front of the tent-merchants' shops; cloths should be supplied to pupils of a school founded by tent-merchant; the masters of the tent-makers and tent-merchants should be appointed as supervisor of the vakıf.

In Ottoman guilds the institution of vakıf was also used for the establishment of provident funds and other arrangements for mutual help. Some guilds owned common property and the income derived from the fund served various purposes.[28] Accumulated capital was lent to members in need of money, for instance those using to enlarge their business. The interest from such loans was assigned to charity, such as the distribution of rice among poor members of the guild or the destitute persons, assistance to sick guild members, and funerals of members who lack sufficient resources for this purpose. The expenditure included payment for shops bought, allotments for education and ritual purposes, repairs of bridges and roads, the management of the vakıfs and various other activities.

---

[26] Ayverdi and Barkan, İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri

[27] G. Baer, 'The Wakf System as a prop...'., p. 19

[28] Ibid., p. 20

The group most closely connected with the vakıf as a profession
was the class of the religious functionaries, the ulema (müftü, kadı,
müderris, naib, mülazim, imam ve hatibler). The ulema represented şeriat
together common law (örf), even they were regarded an important part of
military class, they were more respected than ümera.[29] This group was too
related to the vakıf both as beneficiaries and as administrators; but more
than any other group of people the sheer existence of the ulema as a
social entity was based on the vakıf system.[30] The İstanbul vakıf register
of 1546 pointed out the enourmus extent of property whose income was
used to maintain imam, hatip, müderris students in the medreses and lower
functionaries of the religious worship and instruction. However, ulema
benefited from vakıf not only by the way of allowances and stipends.
Perhaps even more important for their social position and influence was
the fact that very often they were appointed as administrators of vakıfs.
In the 1546 İstanbul register, it is declared that in many vakıfs the imam
of the nearest mosques was appointed as the immediate mütevelli and in even
more vakıfs he was assigned this post after the founder or the extinction of
his freed slaves' offspring.[31]

The ulema group was not below the military class in terms of property
and wealth. A great number of members of ulema were among the founders
of cash vakıfs. A survey on the social and economic structures of the
cities Ankara and Konya in the sixteenth century[32], enlightens the position
of kadı whose properties and cash money made him one of the notables of
urban society. In addition to his purely judicial functions a kadı would
also be responsible for the pious foundations and for the supervison
of the wide spectrum of social services for which the avkaf had instituted.
Besides, imam and hatips whose position were different from the kadı, in
the middle range economicaly, acted as local leader and administrator of
a vakıf rather than an official staff and generally were financed by the

---

[29]Ö. Ergenç, '1580-1596 Yılları Arasında Ankara ve Konya Şehirlerinin
Mukayeseli İncelemesi Yoluyla Osmanlı Şehrinin Kurumları ve Sosyo-Ekonomik
Yapısı Üzerine Bir Deneme', Ank. Üni. DTCF., 1973, Doktora Tezi.

[30]G. Baer, 'The Waqf as a Prop...', p.20

[31]Ayverdi and Barkan, İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri, pp. 7-123

[32]Ö. Ergenç, Doktora Tezi, pp. 209-215

religious and quarter vakıfs. One of the expenditure areas of "avariz akçesi vakfı" -the common fund of a town quarter which composed of local people endowments- was the payment of wages of imam and müezzin who were selected by the local people of every quarter.[33]

The requirement that various vakıf operations be brought to the knowledge and authorization of the kadı as a representative of central authority gave him more importance in the vakıf system. The founders of vakıf were free to set down specific conditions regarding the management and administration of the endowment. While these were considered binding, the kadı in his capacity as overseer of the vakıfs could and often did authorize deviations from them when this appeared to serve general interest of the foundation. This meant that the judge also was in control of a considerable part of what might nowadays be called the municipal affairs. The court was greatly responsible for introducing a dynamism and fluidity into the institution of the vakıf.[34] In this framework, it was possible for the kadı to act as a local servant but at the same time to control the urban society in favour of central authority.

In the Ottoman cities, the urban community was not totally excluded from the affairs related to themselves despite the existence of institutions which were closely connected to the central authority. The group named eşraf and ayan, who had a say in the urban matters, could change and complain of officials in every rank.[35]

> "The sixteenth century records defines eşraf and ayan as a group that organize the relations between the state and reaya in the Ottoman urban society; they are both the representatives of reaya and the assistant of the officials in the execution of state order. As the virtual administrator of the Ottoman city, this group seems to consist of wealthy merchants, experienced craftsmen, famous religious men like imam, hatip, ulema and celebrated tarikat şeyhs."[36]

---

[33] Ibid., p. 235 and p. 257

[34] A. Marcus, 'Piety and Profit...', p. 28

[35] Y. Yücel, 'Osm. Imp.'da Decentralizasyona Dair Gözlemler', Belleten 1974, p. 685

[36] Ö. Ergenç, 'Osmanlı Klasik Dönemindeki Eşraf ve Ayan Üzerine Bazı Bilgiler'. Osmanlı Araştırmaları, 106

Şehir kethüdası, selected from among the ayan, was the leader of
the productive and commercial groups in the urban society and the representative
of reaya. The state took into consideration the demands communicated by
the ayan.[37] The group also affectuated the administration and supervision
of quarter vakıfs, mahalle avarız akçesi. The persistence of eşraf as a
social unit and a political force in some regions, was supported by
vakıfs, so not only the formally recognized nobility, but also the socially
and politically much more important informal elite was sustained in the
same way. It should be added that the notables generally acquired income
or control of existing vakıfs parallel to their social and political power.
The members of other social groups mentioned before were allocated income
from vakıfs or designated as administrators because the founder wanted
to stregthen and support such a group (family, guild, freed slaves) or
because of its religious prestige (ulema). The difference was of course the
result of the fact that the second group were well defined social units,
while the former had a potential base to be a local power in certain areas
and periods.

3.3. Urban Form/Construction Works and Vakıf

During the several centuries when individual construction activity
was able to retain its vigorous development, the main outlines of the
physical texture of Turkish towns were fixed by groups of public services,
buildings erected by public and private vakıfs. This was the pattern of
growth followed by most Turkish towns. Though the absence of classical
planning for the Ottoman town was a generally accepted idea, the locational
considerations which affected the choice of real estate for endowment
were not random. They followed some peculiar patterns which affected
land-use patterns and the city's physical evolution. Of particular impact
were the great acts of endowment which, by virtue of large areas they
affected and the impressive additions they made to the land, left a lasting
imprint on the urban topography.

---

[37]Ibid., p. 109

When an important religious institution was founded, a large body of commercial installations was endowed for its support. Business oriented construction was generally undertaken in places where it could be expected to produce revenue and proximity to the foundation was also expected to benefit. The great majority of the institutions supported by properties in the market area were built in its very midst or in its vicinty. The city's foremost places of prayers and learning were fully exposed to the bustle of daily business. This was not unique to the commercial center; it reflected a city-wide pattern. Almost invariably, the properties for the support of a mosque, school or fountain were located in its close vicinity or in the same quarter. It is seldom that one meets, in the course of a perusal of vakıf assets, a wide geographical disparity among the properties dedicated to an institution. The founders of institutions sought conciously to surround them with a cluster of endowed real estate, to creat a kind of compound.

The mixture in land uses was quite striking. The spiritual and the mundane existed side by side, tied by physical as well as functional connections. Cami was generally built in the heart of the market which was endowed for its support. A medrese was surrounded by endowed commercial properties, sometimes an adjacent cofeehouse. A bath was built at a convenient place in a quarter of the city, thus serving an important need of the citizens and at the same time providing an income for the religious and cultural parts of the benefictions. The bazar section of the town was often chosen as a convenient site for a bath. In an attempt to form the nucleus of a city or a complex of buildings the mosque is often the first to be built. Later a cervansaray, and after a bazar in the form of an arasta and a bath are added. The locational patterns of investments by the large vakıf founders serve as valuable indicators of the developing and desirable parts of the city.

In terms of spatial organization, there was not a consciously designed pattern beyond the central area quarter differentiation in an Ottoman town. While the idea of organized space did not exceed the limits of only one buildings in Seljuk era, in Ottoman period an understanding of architectural order in urban complexes was arrived especially after

the experience of Bursa current.[38] The main principle of the spatial
organization was its functional character, beginning from the central
area every quarter with its own market and mosque was directed to meet the
needs of their inhabitants. It is difficult to see any open space or
square the outside of central area. The quarters were organized according
to such principles as to secure maximum privacy and necessary health
conditions for their inhabitants. There was no other planning attempt outside
the central area, but strict rules and a control mechanism on the
construction activities were at work in every Ottoman town.

Beginning from the palace all constructional works, including
İstanbul and the imperial area, official or not were organized or supervised
by a military organization; 'Hassa Mimarları Ocağı' (The Ottoman Organization
of Architects). The committee was considered as a section of Birûn-The
Outer Service of the Palace-and was attached to the Şehreminliği-Prefecture-
one of the four eminliks (superintendents) within the Ottoman Court.[39]
The şehreminleri who were high ranking civil servants, were responsible
for undertaking the construction and repair of the state buildings and for
performing such other duties as might be required by the Court. The royal
architects were subject to the şehremini concerning the administrative
aspects of the construction and repair work. The şehremini was responsible
for providing the building materials and funds required for the construction
and repair work, while the Chief Architect was mainly concerned with
such technical matters as surveying, planning and actual construction.

Hassa mimarları ocağı consisted of su yolu nazırı (the minister
of water works), İstanbul Ağası, or Acemi Oğlanlar Ağası, Kireççibaşı
(chief of the lime kilns), Anbar müdürü (chief of the stores) Anbar birinci
katibi (clerk of the stores), mimar-ı sani (the second architect), and
Tamirat müdürü (chief of repairs) under the chairmanship of Hassa baş mimarı
(the chief royal architect). The number of technical committee varied from
fourteen to forty three. The establishment date of the organization is
unknown, it estimated to be after 1453.[40]

---

[38] G. Tankut, 'Osmanlı Şehrinde Ticari Fonksiyonların Mekansal
Dağılımı', Türk Tarih Kongresi, 1973

[39] Şerafettin Turan, 'Osmanlı Teşkilatında Hassa Mimarları', Ank.
Üni. DTCFAD, vol I, 1

[40] İbid., 164

The main responsibilities of royal architects were the construction
and repair of court buildings and state building in various parts of the
empire. All palace buildings, castles, fortifications, other military
installations, bridges and roads were regarded as miri constructions and
expenditure on them was met from the state Treasury. The royal architects
also should approve the buildings made by the chief trustee of a vakıf to
prevent any misappropriation. Non-Muslim population was obliged to take a
permission for a repairing from Bâbıâli, in that case allowance was given
in the presence of kadı with the approval of the royal architect. The
permission of all constructional works in towns, hans, baths, shops and
houses depended on Hassa mimarları ocağı which had also the right of demolishing
of unpermitted buildings.

The other responsibilities of this organization were the
determination of the wages of master builders and workers, the price and
quality control of building material and giving the license to the
professionals of this work. The architects and master builders employed
by citizens for the construction of their buildings were obliged to
obtain a certificate showing their professional competence from the
Chief Royal Architect. Thus, even private architects and master builders
outside the capital were subject to control of the organization of
Royal Architects. Besides them, there were also salaried architects
employed by the state in the provinces.

The Chief Royal Architect, all the other architects and other
members of the organization were paid officials of the state. The royal
architects were paid certain professional fees besides their regular
salaries. The Chief Royal Architect received a free of a certain percentage
known as mimarlık harcı i.e. architect's fee, from official constructions
and the construction and repair of vakıf buildings in addition to a special
duty which they collected from the shops and houses of Greek, Armenians
and Jews in Istanbul.[41]

---

[41]Ibid., p. 199

Undoubtely the regulation of construction system in cities,
co-operated with the kadılık, was one of the important duties of the royal
architects. However, due to the military character of the organization,
the principal duty of the chief mayor architect was to set out and repair
the establishments on the main roads before the movement of army corps
and all investments and constructions formed the transportation system
were made for military aims not for the caravan roads.[42] So the organization
of commercial network, similar to the construction works in cities, was
accomplished by individual enterprise. It is difficult to determine the
rate of participation of royal architects to vakıf buildings which were
erected in towns, on commercial routes and even in rural settlements.

Before an official construction began a surveyor's report had
to be prepared by the royal architects; these reports were submitted to
the treasury. After the necessary formalities were completed and the funds
were provided, construction work would be started. A binaemini i.e. a
building superintendent was appointed for major construction which might
be a large mosque or a vakıf complex. Building superintendents were often
selected from among important goverment officials and functioned in the
same way as royal architects in serving the sultans in the name of the
state.[43] The military groups as Acemi Oğlanları, Yaya, Müsellem and Yörük,
as well as prisoners and slaves were employed for the miri construction.
These groups were also employed in the vakıf constructions of the sultans
as in the Süleymaniye mosque and imaret. In the construction of this complex,
the employed labourers were formed of three groups; one was the independant
master builders ans workers receiving wages, the other was the military
organizations as the acemi oğlanları and kul oğlanları, royal architects,
kapıkulu süvarileri, soldiers and officials, and the last one the prisoners
of war.[44] All labourers were paid wages or a nafaka ücreti, i.e. subsistence
wage from the sultan's private funds according to their station and rank
for their work on the construction.

---

[42]İ. Ortaylı, 'Tarihsel Evrimi İçinde Mimarlar', Mimarlık, 1974, 7,
p. 12

[43]M. Cezar, 'Typical Commercial Buildings of the Ottoman Classical
Period and the Ottoman Construction System', p. 285

[44]Ö.L. Barkan, 'Süleymaniye Cami ve İmareti İnşaatı', p. 93

The vakıf complexes were under the constant supervison of competent royal architect, who were also consulted on the selection of the sites of such buildings in cities. Even the private aspects of these constructions, they were regarded in the interest of the public and the royal architects put their services it this disposal. Besides the utilization of royal architects, royal constructions enjoyed some other priveleges; using the state resources to obtain the necessary building materials or carry them to the site of construction. Priority was generally given to official and royal construction and also to constructions of close relations of the sultan. Although the vakıf system could be interpreted as an individual enterprise, it has also an indisputable central character appeared in the using of fonds. The statesmen utilized the state resources in the rate of the sultan's grants and permission allowed in the realization of their private projects. An ordinary individual donor might build a small unit of urban complex with his own special fund. The dynamic structure of vakıf system gave the chance to every kind of constructional activity for public benefit as long as it was proportionate to the rules of Hassa mimarları ocağı.

IV. THE VAKIFS OF İSTANBUL (XVth-XVIth centuries)

In the preceding study, I have tried to define the vakıf ins-
titution itself and the framework within which the institution originated
and operated. This is an attempt to inquiry the traditional urban society
and the way of functioning the institution. This permits us to go a step
further and postulate the existence of institution in an urban network.
So a further study should examine a historical case. But certain
limitations in historical data restrict the probable and questionable
relationships between the urban society and the institution, it is difficult
to arrive the precise assumptions on the factual level.

A study of urban development in Anatolia involves at the same
time a study of Ottoman capital. Urban growth or decline and the living
conditions prevailing in the provinces must always be studied in connection
with the changing circumstances of the capital. The fact that even İstanbul
dominated the urban picture of Anatolia, there should have been
considerable similarities with the other middle-size towns,[1] affected
such a conscious choice. Furthermore, the existing material on pious
foundations for this city is more complete than any other Ottoman town.
The best source of vakıf formation is the foundation deed; drawn up by
the court when an endowment was made, specified the relevant details
about the founder, the properties involved, and the terms and conditions
of the endowment. The registers of Aya Sofya and Fatih complexes and the
İstanbul register dated 1546 are the main sources on this subject.
Beginning form the fifteenth century my study will examine the vakıf's
siginificance in Istanbul with a broad look at the process of vakıf
formation. How prevalent was the creation of endowment in İstanbul during
the period? What types of vakıfs did people establish? Who were their
founders? Which aspects of urban life did they involve?

---

[1] The studies of S. Faroqhi and Ö. Ergenç

4.1. İstanbul as an Islamic City

"Up to the eighteenth century, we can not see any major change
in the spatial structure of the traditional city of İstanbul and
in the hierarchy between the sub-structures. This fact is rather
due to the absence of any qualitative change in the social and
economic activities of the city; and also due to the reflection
of this stability to space as it is. (..) Such a traditional
space organization is identical with the determining patterns seen
in the feudal cities every country either in the West Europe or
in the Middle East."[2]

The problematic is the appreciation of the existent means in
the settlement and re-production of spatial organization, not only in
environmental sense but as a result of social and economic conditions
in historical perspective. An attempt to understand and explain the
institutions which let prosper of a town would be meaningful instead
focusing on east-west dichotomy. For five centuries, vakıf system provided
urban services and played an important role in the urban communal life.
Beginning from the conquest up to the nineteenth century, the development
of social services in İstanbul was determined by the circumstances of
endowments. Really, it would be possible to observe the methods used
by Ottomans in the stages of the improvement of the capital town.

Following the conquest the methods of encouraging people to move
to new settlements -giving the people houses and freed them taxes for a
specified time, promising there fugees the restoration of their property,
freedom of worship, freedom of work- and forcing them to move to new
area of settlement were both applied in İstanbul. The aim in sending people
to settle in İstanbul was not only to increase its population, but to make
the capital a lively and bustling city. Therefore efforts were made to
attract merchants, wealthy citizens, artisans and professional people to the
city. Some well known merchants and businessmen, especially, were invited
to move to İstanbul. In the decrees of compulsory resettlement dispatched
to the provinces it was demanded that a certain ratio be observed in
ensuring the inclusion of wealth and poor families among these subjected
to compulsory resettling.

---

[2] İ. Ortaylı, 'İstanbul'un Mekansal Yapısının Tarihsel Evrimine
Bir Bakış, p. 77

The first stage in the development of İstanbul as an Ottoman town was the Aya Sofya vakfı which includes, besides the mosque and medrese of Aya Sofya, other Byzantine religious buildings converted to Muslim use, the Zeyrek cami and its medreses, Pantokrator and Pantepopt.[3] In 1457 Mehmed II. made over the vakıfs of Aya Sofya, the Byzantine buildings still standing in the city; these are noted in the documents as 'sultani' and mukataali. A survey of 1489 notes 1093 mukataali houses in İstanbul and Galata, apart from the Byzantine houses occupied by kuls of Padişah, these later must have numbered 335, it was the practice that mukata'a should not be levied on a house hold by a kul, so long as the kul actually resided there. For some time after the conquest, all houses granted the people as freehold property (mülk) were taken back and levied on mukata'a and assigned to the vakıf of Aya Sofya with the advice of Nişancı Mehmed Paşa.[4]

Apart from these Byzantine buildings, Mehmed II. donated to the vakıf of Aya Sofya other revenue producing establishments which would at the same time the economic and social needs of the population and encourage settlement.

> "The person entrusted with the duty of arrangement of the vakfiyes as the other members of the Feneri family asserted the complement of the register of Ayasofya Cami-i Şerif which indicated the vakıfs in İstanbul, Galata and Üsküdar and explained the boundaries of vakıfs in detail after the recitation of besmele and prayer in 1519."[5]

The Bedestan with the Büyük Çarşı built around it; the Eski Kervansaray and Yemiş Kapanı at Tahtakale, the Unkapanı were some of them. Aya Sofya register of 1493 records, in İstanbul and Galata 2350 shops, 4 hans, 2 baths, 21 bozahane, 22 baş-hane, and 987 mukataali houses with an annual revenue of 718.421 akçe.[6] It is important to note that the all revenues of Aya Sofya vakfı were supplied fron urban sources different from the following great vakıfs. The entire source of income consisted a only of fixed assets and most of these properties were not new buildings, but the old ones from Byzantine times, appropriated by the state. The vakıf register of Aya Sofya, dated 1519 includes the details as the names of property owners, their neighbours, the area of buildings and the

---

[3] O.N. Ergin, Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi, pp. 11-12

[4] Ibid., p. 37

[5] Ş. Tekindağ, 'Ayasofya Tahrir Defterine Göre İstanbul, VI. Türk Tarih Kongresi

[6] Ency. of Islam, s.v. 'İstanbul', p. 229

amount of mukata'a or rent. There were ten cabiliks to collect the revenues in Bedestan, Köşesaray(Yedikule), Tahtakale, Deniz Kenarı, Balat, Sultan-pazarı (Fatih), Salhane, Hanlar ve başçı hanları and Galata.[7] The number of vakıf staff whose great majority employed in Aya Sofya, Zeyrek, Galata... mosques and mescids as personel, mutevelli, katib and cabi was approximately 457.

Aya Sofya had been the social center where the ruler and the community met together at an accession and at every Friday prayer, where the ruler received petitions, and where the great religious ceremonies were held and the social and economic institutions and establishments which fostered the life of the city and the well-being of its inhabitants came into existence first as vakıf of this Great Mosque. After the conquest İstanbul was divided into thirteen nahiyes, the first one is the nahiye of Aya Sofya. In 1459, Mehmed II. called his notables together and commanded them each to choose an area which should be called after him. anywhere in the city and build there a mosque, a han, a bath and a market, he himself selecting the site for the new palace, also picked the finest area in the middle of the city for building a mosque, 'which should surpass Aya Sofya'.[8] The other nahiyes grew up around the mosques built up by this group, whilst the smaller units, the mahalles, constituting the nahiye each grew up around a local mosque or mescid.

The following table shows the number of vakıfs recorded for each nahiye:[9]

---

[7] O.N. Ergin, Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi, pp. 38-41

[8] Encyc. of Islam, 'İstanbul', p. 229

[9] Ayverdi and Barkan, İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri

	number of mahalles	yakıfs in 1546	vakıfs in 1596
1 Aya Sofya	17	191	345
2 Mahmud Paşa	9	96	115
3 Ali Paşa	5	44	76
4 İbrahim Paşa	10	106	129
5 Sultan Beyazıd	23	198	319
6 Ebu'l-Vefa	12	165	306
7 Sultan Mehemmed	41	372	681
8 Sultan Selim	7	33	90
9 Murad Paşa	23	119	330
10 Davud Paşa	13	84	264
11 Mustafa Paşa	30	65	227
12 Topkapı	7	13	39
13 Ali Paşa	22	108	259

Thus the same patterns, based on the institution of vakıf, which had been evident in all cities of the Middle East began to appear in İstanbul. An elaborate vakıf complex, any part of it and other urban services, water supply, paving of roads, public security, hospitals, street cleaning, the shelter and feeding of the poor and of travellers were realized by members of the ruling class. Even sultan and leading statesmen created a series of foundation complexes, while less prominent individuals brought into existence smaller complexes of the mescid with its school which was to serve as the center of a new mahalle. In 1546, the number established vakıfs were 2517 and in the following half century 1600 new ones were added.[10] There was thus, as in the improvement of Islamic cities, a hierarcihal gradation of complexes in İstanbul.

[10] İ. Tekeli, 'Anadolu'da Kentsel Yaşamın Örgütlenmesinde Değişik Aşamalar', Toplum-Bilim.

4.2. The Imaret of Fatih

Up to the construction of Fatih complex for eighteen years Aya Sofya fulfilled especially educational and religious functions. The mosque itself began in 1463, was completed in 1471. The ancillary buildings were of two types; hayrat around the mosque and buildings of public utility to provide income for the upkeep of the foundation.

The building of mosque and medreses were completed althogether. An area of about 100.000 m^2 occupied by the mosque, with an extensive outer courtyard entered by eight gates; on two sides of it, 8 large and 8 small medreses (tetimme or medresepece) and to the east, in a seperate court a tabhane, a hospice, a han and a hospital in a further court. Between the two four entrances to the mosque-court were two smaller buildings, a children's school and a library. There were also residences in the vicinity for the ulema employed in the medreses.[11] The buildings of the second category were, principally, a great çarşı comprised 280 shops, 32 workrooms and 4 storerooms and the Saraçhane compires 110 shops within a wall. The register of 1493 lists 142 suddlers, all Muslims working here. A bath, on the north of the mosque was also the property of vakıf.[12]

The central bazar in the new capital was also established near the wall of the Old Palace, the bedesten undoubtedly forming its focal point with a number of shops and business hans. It is clear from his vakfiye Mehmed the Conquerer built shops in various parts of İstanbul. Most of these shops were where the covered bazar now stands. The reference relating to this in the vakfiye as follows;

> "He built in the said city in Galata bazars, shops, baths, hans, hills dwellings and lodgings, all of which he donated in the proper legal manner. One of this buildings is the bezzazistan, shops of the cloth merchants. It is situated near the imaret of Mahmud Paşa in the Çakır quarter of the city. It consists of 118 sanduk, all belonging to the vakıf of the Sultan. The shops here occupied by cloth merchants, takyeci and tailors. All the shops in the street called Bit Pazarı (the Flea Market) 849 shops in all are occupied by cloth marchants. They are all part of the vakıf of the sultan."[13]

---

[11]S. Ünver, Fatih Külliyesi, pp. 10-25

[12]Encyc. of Islam, 'İstanbul', p. 229

[13]Fatih II. Vakfiyeleri, Vakıflar Genel Müd.

It is clear from the vakfiye of Fatih that of the 1114 shops bequeated
by him, 849 are in the bedestan, while 265 are in the Mahmud Paşa imaret
area. It seems that the addition of other vakıfs around the nucleus
formed by the vakıf of the sultan, the Bazar developed rapidly. The Aya
Sofya vakfı defteri gives the names of vakıfs, the names of streets and
the number of shops during the years 1489-1491. E.H. Ayverdi who examined
this defter estimates the number of shops here during the reign of Mehmed
II. to be about 2000.[14]

The most important founder of business establishment was Mahmud
Paşa, long time Grand Vizier to Mehmed II. and also a minor poet. His
vakıf complex in İstanbul which contains the oldest extant mosque in
the city, was supported by a han in Bursa, and also by the bedesten and
Kurşunlu Han in Ankara.[15] But above all, it received revenues from the
mentioned shops, a part of the immense Kapalı Çarşı. The han and bedestan
of Mahmud Paşa in Ankara formed the center of the business district.
Besides the commercial importance of his foundation was equally derived
from the ordinary shops associated with it. Therefore, Ankara administrators
of this vakıf frequently appeared in the kadı's court, leasing out shops
or approving transfers from one lessee to the other. Foundation administrators
ans lessees had one interest in common; to prevent any decline in the
profits derived from foundation-owned shops. For the administrator,
decreasing profitability meant vacancies and consequently loss of revenue.
Thus around 1650, the Chief of the Black Eunuchs in the Sultan's Palace
in İstanbul, who was also in charge of pious foundations administered
directly by the Treasury, provided an imperial rescript protecting the
interests of the lessess of vakıf property in Ankara.[16]

Nothing as was as the Fatih complex had been attempted before in
Edirne, Bursa, İznik or elsewhere, and vastness remains its overall
effects in a city. With the beginning and development of the Ottoman
style of architecture in Bursa (1400-1460) a new tradition was born.
Building a mosque and a medrese inter connected, or in close proximity was

---

[14]E.H. Ayverdi, İstanbul Mahalleleri, Şehrin İskanı ve Nüfusu

[15]S. Faroqhi, Towns and Townsmen in Ottoman Anatolia, p. 41

[16]Ibid., p. 42

an ancient Islamic tradition though the addition of public buildings and
creating a small independent community within a city was an innovation
of this period. Until the reign of Fatih, all built complexes were preparation
for the imperial vakıfs (selatin vakıfları). In terms of the internal
program of buildings, the development was completed in this first period.
Every building in the complex was exceptional for size and scale, and the
dome of the mosque was the largest the Ottomans had yet built. The Fatih
Cami was probably never remarkable for gracefulness or decoration, but
its achievement lay in providing a tremendous space of unified domed
prayer-hall, for more sophisticated in its spatial design than for instance
the Great Mosque at Bursa. At Fatih the mosque is planned to be at the very
centre of its complex, reached after climbing past an outer line of
subsidiary buildings to the platform where a courtyard of size equal to
the mosque prepares the worshipper for quitting the noisy world of
caravans, soup-kitchen and so on.

> "Fatih complex is the most developed example with respect to
> both its functions and its spatial organization. The architectural
> characteristic of this complex is the central position of the
> mosque which was surrounded by the other units in a geometrical
> order. As a result a centralized and simetrical arrangement comes
> into being. (..) The urban complexes founded by the rulers
> -selatin vakıfları- have a mosque at the center, located just
> between the internal courtyard and the large external courtyard.
> The other buildings of the complex have been constructed around
> this external courtyard in a geometrical order and vertical to
> each other. In the complexes intentionally constructed as a
> compact unit, external courtyard is surrounded by a windowed
> wall and has huge gates led to the streets and squares. As
> independent units the other buildings have their courtyards
> directly opened to the external courtyard through a gate. Later,
> this schemehas been used by Sinan as the basic form in Süleymaniye
> complex (1550-57) and the others."[17]

---

[17]T. Reyhanlı, Osmanlı Külliye Mimarisinin Değişimi, p. 121

The rows of multi-domed dependencies which lie along the hillside, the huge arcaded courtyard, avenues, archways and steps, all on entering suggest a miniature city in which there seems always plenty of human activity. The vakfiye of Fatih was recorded in the court register by the grand vizier Mahmud Paşa about 1472 in the name of Mehmed II. The vakıfname begins with a praising text to the sultan and continues the names and boundaries of properties which were assigned to the foundation in the city and countryside. The foundation document ended with the stipulations about the amount of revenue and the expenditure areas. For the Fatih imaret, there follow the principal vakfiyes, of which the first one is dated 1472, and published by O.N. Ergin,[18] another one which Beyazıd II. arranged in the name of his father in 1495 published by Tahsin Öz.[19] Designation of different vakfiyes parallel to changing circumstances was a pervasive implementation.

The income of the Fatih complex came from 1130, houses, 2466 shops, 54 mills, 57 bachelors' lodgings, 26 cellors, 4 hamams, 7 birgos 2 kapans and 2 gardens in Galata and Üsküdar.[20] The distribution of the shops was as follows; the bedesten with 118 niches and 286 shops nearby; 206 shops, 33 cells in the pazar known as Sultan Pazarı near the Fatih Mosque, 110 shops in the Saraçlar Çarşısı, 256 shops near the Mahmud Paşa İmaret, 77 shops in the vicinity of Dikilitaş; 45 shops at the Odun Kapısı, 27 shops at Debbaghane (tannery) 32 shops at Salhane (slaughter house); 45 shops at Bakırcılar Çarşısı (coppersmith bazar), 93 cells in the upper and lower floors of a han known as Sultan Han or Bey Kervansarayı, which was one of the hans in the vicinity of Mahmud Paşa Hamamı. Moreover, the hans known as the Eski Han and Yeni Han also belonged to the Fatih İmaret.

[18] O.N. Ergin, Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi

[19] T. Öz, Fatih II. Vakfiyeleri

[20] O.N. Ergin, Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi, p. 16

The following table illustrates the sources of the incomes of eleven vakıf foundations for the fiscal year 1489-1490,[21] (cizye-433698 akçe),

Name of Establishment	Total annual income (akçe)	% from cities	% from villages
Fatih İmareti	1500611	17[x]	83[xx]
Eyüb Türbesi	117855	3.7	96.3
Beyazıd I. İmareti (Edirne)	161564	22	78
Beyazıd II. İmareti (Edirne)	578663	27.6	72.4
Murat II. İmareti (Edirne)	385030	12.3	87.7
Murad II. İmareti (Edirne)	106285	22.7	77.3
Süleyman Paşa Zaviyesi (Bolayır)	86985	1.3	98.7
TOTAL		18	82
Ayasofya Cami	789838	100	-
Murad II. Cami (Edirne)	317292	3	97
Murad II. Darulhadisi (Edirne)	187786	61	39
Eski Cami (Edirne)	87917	100	-
TOTAL		72.4	27.6
GRAND TOTAL		35.4	64.6

[x]Rents of some lands and 12 baths in İstanbul

[xx]The tax revenues of 8667 Christians and Jews in İstanbul

[21]Ö.L. Barkan, 'İmaret Sitelerinin Kuruluş ve İşleyiş Tarzına Ait Araştırmalar', p. 253

the produce of 57 villages in Çorlu, Tekirdağ, Ereğli ve Kırklarili, (723220), and income from the sale of some agricultural produce (88460).

Of the mosque and imaret vakıf referred to in the table, two were founded in the fourteenth century and the rest in the fifteenth century. Over ninety percent of the incomes of such establishments as Eyüb Türbesi, Süleyman Paşa Zayviyesi and the Murad II. Mosques in Edirne are from comparatively small lands. Distribution of this revenue according to the expenditure areas for the same imarets during the fiscal year of 1489-1490 is as in follows;[22]

Name of Establishment	total of expenditure	salaries %	purchase and % other expenditure
Fatih İmareti	1483931	58.6	41.4
Eyüb Türbesi	104702	60.4	39.6
Beyazıd I. İmareti (Edirne)	182619	47.7	52.3
Beyazıd II. İmareti (Edirne)	657971	37.2	62.8
Murad II. İmareti (Edirne)	325720	53.8	46.2
Murad II. İmareti (Ergene)	85733	51.2	48.8
Süleyman Paşa Zaviyesi (Bolayır)	130397	58.2	41.8
TOTAL	2971073		
Ayasofya Cami	526666	88	12
Murad II. Cami (Edirne)	260307	91.5	8.5
Murad II. Darülhadisi (Edirne)	155831	89.6	10.4
Eski Cami (Edirne)	78829	96.5	3.5
TOTAL EXP. for mosques	1021633	90	10
TOTAL EXP. for imaret and mosques	3992706	62.6	34.7

[22]Ibid., p. 287

The great part of the expenditure involved to the soup-kitchen which generally reachs the ninety three percent of the total. When a darüşşifa exists in an urban complex, this unit would form seventeen percent of the total expenditure. Same imarets seperated eighteen percent of their revenues for the repair works and the upkeep of the foundation. The expenses for the Fatih complex were:

stipents   869280 akçe
food for the hospice   461417
expenses of the hospital   72000
repairs, etc.   18522

The personnel of the mosque numbered 102 in all, of the medreses 168, of the hospice 45, of the hospital 30. There were further agents and clerks to collect the revenues (12), and builders and workmen (17). Besides these 383 persons, regular payments were made to ingent ulema and their children and to disabled soldiers; these charities amounted to 202291 akçe per year.

A recently founded document related to the vakfiye of Fatih İmaret asserted the detailed information about the distribution of personnel to the sections of the imaret and their daily salaries.[23] The salaries amounted are the same with the original vakfiye even there are little differences between the personnels,

---

[23] S. Ünver, 'Fatih Külliyesine ait diğer Mühim bir Vakfiye, Vakıflar Dergisi, vol. I, pp. 39-45

The personnel of the mosque:

1 Hatib		30	akçe
2 İmam	(for each)	10	"
12 Müezzin		5	"
10 Devirhan		5	"
20 Cüz'han		2	"
20 Muvahhidler		2	"
10 Selevati şerifeyan		2	"
5 Selevati faiteyi kaza eden		7	"
1 Muarrif		6	"
1 Muvakkatçi		10	"
6 Kayyim		5	"
4 Çerağdar		5	"
1 Bevvap		3	"
1 Ferraş		3	"
1 Noktacı		3	"

The personnel of the tomb:

2 Türbedar	5	akçe
10 Cüz'han	2	"
1 Ser mahfil	3	"
1 Muarrif ve müferrik	1	"
4 Muhafız	3	"
1 Buhurcu	2	"
1 Saka	2	"
1 Çerağdar ve ferraş	2	"
1 Noktacı	3	"

The personnel of Medarisi Semaniye[x]

Medarisi mezbure müderrisi	50	akçe	1 Bevvab	2	akçe
1 Muid	5	"	1 Ferraş	2	"
10 Danismend	2	"			

The personnel of Tetümmati Semaniye:

1 Bevvab	2 akçe
1 Kafızı kütüb	6 akçe
1 Katibi kütüb	4 akçe

The personnel of hospital:

2 Tabib	20	akçe	1 Hafizi eşribe	4	akçe
1 Kilerce	4	"	1 Bevvab	3	"
1 Vekilharç	4	"	2 Aşçı	3	"
1 Kehhal	8	"	2 Came şuy	3	"
1 Cerrah	8	"	1 Duvarda nakışları meneden	2	"
1 Tabbahi eşribe	6	"	1 Şeyh	20	"

---

[x]the remaining seven ones are not included

The personnel of Imaret:

1 Katib	6	akçe	6 Ekmekçi	4	akçe
1 Vekilharç	5	"	1 Et hemali	3	"
1 Kilerci	5	"	2 Buğday ayırtlayıcı	3	"
2 Ferraş	3	"	2 Çanak yuyucu	5	"
2 Kayyum	3	"	2 İmaret ahirinda bevvap	2	"
2 Çerağdar	3	"			
4 Nakip	3	"	1 Anbarcı	2	"
2 Bevvab	3	"	1 Odun hamalı	2	"
6 Aşçı	4	"	1 Duvarlarda nakışları meneden	2	"

In 1490, at least 117 persons except the needy people, received two meals everyday and 3300 loaves were distributed at the hospice. The imaret also functioned as a center of social security, the kadı himself selected the needy people, widows and orphons who were paid regular aids. The commercial importance of the foundation was derived from the shops in the city and equally revenue sources outside İstanbul. Besides being a religious and educational center, this complex was a nucleus for the economic and social prosperity of the city. The thirteen nahiye of the city which comprised a number of mahalles constituted the serious of complexes, even the mescids like the camis were supported by vakıfs.

CONCLUSION

"To control the state requires a large army. To support the troops requires great wealth. To obtain this wealth the people must be prosperous. For the people to be prosperous the law must be just. If any one of these is neglected the state will collapse."[1]

The circle of justice recommended by Kutadgu Bilig was one of the bases of Ottoman political theory. The circle of eqity designated the circular relationship among the various classes of the society and their functions in a well-run state. Justice in this theory of state means the protection of the subjects against abuse from the representatives of authority, and prosperity of the subjects is the responsibility of the state. The well-being of the people is the guarantee of the stability of the system and the collection of taxes. The great urban complexes established by the rulers and other statesmen served to reproduce the political and ideological principles of the system and at the same time functioned as a social security mechanism supported by philantrophic ideas. Traditional norms and pious principles for distribution of wealth were inherent in the system of relations between the administrative class and the subjects. The concept of state in Islamic political theory interwined with the concept of justice which formed an ideological basis for the justification of the vakıf foundations beginning from the earliest Islamic tradition.

The particular emphasis of this study has been upon the role of the vakıf institution in the society and economy of the Ottoman city. In the literature on the traditional 'Islamic city', the pious foundations are not discussed as one of the elements of the urban order similar to the quarters, guilds and religious communities. Our major argument, in the context of Ottoman cities has been that the 'vakıf institution', more than being one among others, was a means for organization on a communal basis; a highly flexible instrument welding together the public good and private initiative; mediating between economic and political frameworks and spheres of the urban order. Unless the vakıf institution in its multitude of functions is taken into account, the Ottoman city appears to lack in a communal institutional fabric, which is precisely what the 'Islamic city' formulations lead me to consider.

---

[1] H. İnalcık, "The Ottoman Empire: THe Classical Age 1300-1600", p.66

a. Public good, private initiative and the vakıf institution

Simultaneously with the public significance of the vakıf institution, where the ruler and members of the governing elite provided services for the common good, their acts would at the same time be considered acts of individual philantrophy. The individualistic character of the institution involved a political purpose from the point of view of the power groups stratified according to their relations with the state. In Ottoman society, a central executive authority formed by "slave" administrators (established by 'devşirme' system -a name applied to the forcible recruitment of Christian children for the Janissary regiments and for service in the Imperial palaces) kept under control the power groups outside the central realm and the military class. Being a vakıf founder was a protected status which allowed the continuation of a family name or local nobility even under 'repression'. In such a political context, the vakıf could be regarded as the main vehicle for the continuity of private wealth and its protection from the state intervention. It was a major factor in the maintenance of family wealth, prestige and power not only through direct endowment to family members, but also by placing the administration of charitable evkaf in the hands of founder's family and by enhancing the prestige of the family through the establishment and maintenace of social works particulary in the family's geographical and social spheres of influence.

The vakıf was an institutional system in which the individual authority was recognized and individual enterprise was legitimized by the protection of property rights and by the shared philantrophic ideas. The economic operations of the vakıf foundations with a considerable degree of dynamism and flexibility, influenced the capital formation, real estate market and commercial activities. For İnalcık, the administration of a vakıf may be compared with the trust.[2] The endower appointed an administrator, mütevelli, and for a large vakıf a supervisor, nazır, over him. The mütevelli is responsible for the maintenance of the vakıf in fulfilling the conditions of the vakfiye and for guarding and increasing the sources of income. To achieve this, he may engage in economic enterprise, by

---

[2]H. İnacık, 'Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire', Journal of Economic History, XXIX, pp. 97-140

investing surplus income. The employees, who at a lower level have responsibility for the administration of the vakıf, meet the mütevelli once a year and check his activities and his accounts for the past year; they can apply to the kadı for his dismissal. Vakıf accounts were also checked under the Ottomans by the representative of the state according to the principle of public trusteeship. Thus the vakıf acquired in Islamic society, in terms of both its foundation and its activity, the character of an economic enterprise combining the private initiative with public good.

b. Local social groups, centralized executive power and the vakıf institution

The vakıf was a key institution in the articulation of relations between local, provincial groups and the centralized executive power in Ottoman society. It was an intermediate structure, not independent from central authority -founders were mostly statesmen- but internally autonomous and based upon property rights. The administrative structure of the Ottoman state was not an undifferentiated and integrated whole in terms of social and political interests. The diverse strata of the administrative realm whose power and prestige changed through time enjoyed a measure of autonomy by the establishment of vakıf institution. In general terms, the vakıf was not a civil authority against the state authority.

Although the state did not recognize it as a corporate entity, the vakıf institution could be considered a source of social and political power for certain groups. At the center, the slave bureaucrats were entrusted with executive power and the ulema with the administration of law including the supervision of all legal and financial matters. The ulema also had a privileged position among the administrative groups in terms of civil rights.[3] The existence of ulema as a social unit was closely supported by the vakıf system and the local religious establishments were one of the notable groups in the provincial society. There were famous ulema families who were not only the founders of their own vakıfs but also

---

[3] Ş. Mardin, 'Tabakalaşmanın Tarihsel Belirleyicileri: Türkiye'de Toplumsal Sınıf ve Sınıf Bilinci', Felsefe Yazıları, 5, p. 13

known as the supervisors of the public vakıfs. In the eighteenth century, the ulema was the most influencial group among the vakıf founders after the military class and they had attained more power especially with the decreasing importance of slave administrators.

The other notable group in the provincial town, eşraf and ayan did not exhibit a clear picture in their relations to the vakıf system reflecting their somewhat ambiguous political role. The group could be recognized in the sixteenth century; from time to time they acquired control over the established vakıf system by using their political and social power. But they never formed an important group among the founders even in periods when they were economically much more powerful. The local notables were not primarily interested in becoming enterpreneurs and building up autonomous power.[4] The authority of eşraf and ayan increased as the authority of the state in the localities became weakened. They opted rather to be intermediaries between the state and the peasants.

The vakıf institutions, similar to other secondary structures, such as guild organizations, tribal organizations and village councils, were the connecting links between the state and the local people. The state controlled the local powers through the appointed local administrators and fief holders. The secondary structures, although under the supervision of local governors, enjoyed internal autonomy. In the vakıf system, state authority was exercised through the recording of vakfiyes on the kadı's registers and through the supervision of statesmen aimed to maintain the public nature of the institution. The individual founder who might come from an ulema family or a local notable took into consiteration communal needs in their stipulations to keep their social prestige. To support social services for the urban society with the income of pious endowments was the common endevour of the power groups. An examination of the vakıf activities in an urban environment indicates how the institution fulfilled diversified functions in an urban society.

---

[4] Ş. Mardin, 'Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire', Comparative Studies in Society and History, June 1969, pp. 258-281

c. Spatial and functional organization of the urban society and the vakıf
   institution

Many evkafs involving a cami, a mescid, a medrese, a mektep,
a hospital, a zaviye, a han or an imaret, water supply, orphons or a
combination of two or more of these religious and charitable institutions
were established through individual initiative. The economic realm of
urban society took form with the social capital formation, the local
patterns of the investments and the leasing of property which was financed
and arranged by the vakıf activities. While the ideological and social
power of the organized urban groups, the guilds, central and peripheral
religious groups, eşraf and ayan was solidified by the vakıf institution;
at the same time a vast array of urban services ranging from commercial
installations to the pavements of roads were organized and produced
through the same channels.

The mosques and the water fountains were the most vital, important
facilities maintained by the vakıf system. They were central to the life
of the quarters. In the numerous endowments of the sixteenth century,
the quarter mosque followed by the quarter fountains headed the list of
beneficiaries.[5] The system of public fountains provided the water supply
in the city and the sebilci -man who distributed water gratis- kept the
fountain clear and supervised and was financed by the evkaf. Business
oriented buildings for the support of the mosque, school or fountain were
located in its close vicinity or in the same quarter.

Up to the nineteenth century, the capital formation necessary
for the investments in social services, not only for urban society but
also the entire imperial domain, were mainly financed by the vakıf system.
For the vakıf system to reproduce itself, vakıf administrators always
tried to utilize the market circumstances and economic activities aimed
to generate profit. The most important fact related to the economic
conditions of vakıfs was the highly pragmatic and flexible structure of the
institution in responding to changing economic conditions. A few examples

---

[5]Ö.L. Barkan E.H. Ayverdi, 'İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri'

will serve to illustrate this point. The leasing of vakıf property was an
important economic activity of the institution. But when the fires in the
big cities of Anatolia and Rumelia and the Bilad-i Selasi of İstanbul ruined
the wooden buildings, the vakıfs did not have enough funds to rebuild
all these areas. Growing difficulties in financing the rebuilding activity
led to the law of "icareteyn" which was proclaimed in 1642.[6] According
to this law, the tenant had acquired the usufruct right by paying a sum
approximating the real value of the property and continued to pay a fixed
rent annually. Another type of vakıf operation was the investments in
the construction and rehabitation of real estate. Here again the
specific arrangements were highly flexible. In the building of craft
markets, the land property belonged to the vakıf institution, but the
construction expenditures were often financed by the craft organization
and vakıf began to get rents after the completion of the construction.

A great number of vakıf founders invested their capital partly
or totally in the construction of productive and commercial installations
in cities. These were believed to be the ideal vakıfs, for they were
long enduring and secured a steady rent. It was such vakıfs that were
mainly responsible for the development of economic life in cities. Just
as the guild organizations controlled the economic life of urban society
and quaranteed the collection of taxes, the vakıf institution served to
activate the economic life in the city and to supply public services for
the urban society.

d. The communal fabric and the vakıf institution

The quarters as small integrated communities with their close
family ties and ethnic and religious homogeneity formed the units of
spatial urban form. The significance of the quarter as a focus of loyalty
is well illustrated by the pattern of endowments. Of particular importance
was the use of the vakıf as a tool for mutual aid within the framework
of the quarter. The maintenance of the public establishments was provided
by cash vakıfs for which the necessary funds was collected from among

---

[6]N. Öztürk, 'Menşei ve Tarihi Gelişimi Açısından Vakıflar', p. 108

the rich people of the quarter. The income sources of the vakıfs founded
by the residents of town-quarter came from the fund to be lent at
interest of about ten percent. In many quarters, real property or capital
had been endowed for the interest of the poor as well as for a variety of
local expenses. In the sixteenth century, the vakıfs also played a role
in the fiscal functioning of the town quarters. In the İstanbul register
of 1546 some vakıfs whose income was allocated among different purposes
also included the payment of avariz-i mahalle, i.e. contributions exacted
from the urban quarter as a whole by the Sultan's urfi authority.
Instances of vakıfs providing assistance to inhabitants of specific
town quarters to comply with their tax obligations occur in the eighteenth
and nineteenth centuries as well.[7]

When the townspeople founded quarter or urban-based vakıfs,
they had a purpose in their mind to keep the solidarity among the community
and to support the town quarter as a social unit. The very frequent
stipulations according to which the imam of the mosque of the town quarters
should be appointed as administrator to the vakıf indicates the role of
the quarter in the social system. In many other stipulations, it was endowed
that at the death of the founder the cemaat-i mahalle should choose his
successor as the administrator of the vakıf. In some cases, the cemaat-i
mahalle were not given the right to appoint the mütevelli but only to
supervise him in the capacity of nazır. All the facts point out that
the vakıf institution did not only belong to its founder but also to the
local people benefiting from the fruits of the foundation especially
on the quarter level. Beginning from the imperial vakıfs, all the vakıf
institutions had a common feature, functioning on an urban base and
having a public nature in implementation.

On the basis of the detailed discussion of the vakıf institution
provided in this study, it is possible to suggest that contrary to the
common opinion, the towns people and villages were integrated around
economic institutions rather than political ones in the Ottoman social
structure. Like the guild organizations, vakıf institution comprised all

---

[7] H.B. Kunter, 'Türk Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri', Vakıflar Dergisi, V. 1., pp. 122-123

the people came from different socio-economic, ethnic and religious groups. Urban communal life structured not on the municipal corporations or city councils, but on the urban based and internally autonomous institutions. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the organizational reforms transformed the traditional urban organizations into a distinctive urban form of association in which the municipal organization took the place of vakıf institution.

In the Ottoman society, the early attempts for the establishment of municipal organization had begun in the reign of Mahmut II, in the course of the reforms following the abolishment of Janissary organization. İhtisap Nezareti -office for the superintendent of guilds and markets- was founded in 1826 (in the same year with the establishment of Evkaf-i Humayun Nezareti, ministry of evkaf) to supervise the tradesmen and crafts, and was transformed into the ministry of finance in time. In the same period the appointment of a muhtar -headman of a quarter or a village- and the foundation of an administrative group by elder men in every quarter were initiated by central authorities. In 1836, the ministry of evkaf took over the responsibility for management of urban services which came to be known as municipal affairs later. The organizational reforms at the administrative level continued after the proclomation of Tanzimat in 1839 throughout the nineteenth century. At the urban level, the city of İstanbul was the first to come under the direct influence of the westernization process and the Anatolian town pursued the same reforms a slightly different process. The first muhtarlıks (quarter administration) were organized in the mahalles of Bilad-i Selase (Galata/Beyoğlu, Üsküdar and Eyüp) in 1829 and hence an important part of the duties of imams were transferred to muhtars. Many imperial edicts registered in the years 1833-35 commanded to the governors and mütesellims (deputy lieutenant-governor and local collector of taxes) in the provinces of Anatolia and Rumelia to constitute muhtarlıks.[8] İstanbul Şehremaneti (municipality of İstanbul) was established in 1854 to replace the old şehremini as an implementation of the French 'prefecture de le ville'.[9] Municipal reforms

---

[8]M. Çadırcı, 'Türkiye'de Muhtarlık Teşkilatının Kuruluş Tarih ve Nazırlarının Hal Tercümeleri', Vakıflar Dergisi, 1982

[9]S. Denel, 'Batılılaşma Sonucu İstanbul'da Tasarım ve Dış Mekanlarda Değişme', p. 15

Municipal reforms continued with the formation of Galata and Beyoğlu Numune Dairesi, a municipal organization which had many similar characteristics with the municipality of Paris, and the subsequent creation of fourteen administrative units in the city in 1868.

Until the nineteenth century, the vakıf institutions were administrered by their own internal organization (mainly by a nazır and a mütevelli) while central supervision was carried out by the kadı and appointed officials for public benefit. In the nineteenth century, vakıf revenues became increasingly insufficient to finance all the social works which they had provided for centruies, because of the misaapropriations in the vakıf administration and the diminution of state land. Mustafa Paşa, the minister of evkaf nezareti, explained the causes of the establishment of Evkaf-i Hümayun Nezareti in Netayic-ül Vukuat;[10]

> "At the beginning of the nineteenth century, all the real estate and land within the city entirely became vakıf lands. Since all the purchase and sale operations in the real estate market remained in the hands of vakıf mütevellis and collectors of vakıf revenues (cabi), a disorder in property system emerged. The establishment of the administrative units of İstanbul, Galata, and Eyüp kadıs and later of those of Kaptanpaşa and Janissary Ağa, Sekbanbaşı and Bostancıbaşı, in addition to the formation of administrative units of grandvezir, şeyhülislam and Darüşşüade Ağası led to the existence of independent vakıf's nezarets (administrative units) in İstanbul. Consequently the ministry of evkaf was created to centralize all these independant administrative units and they joined in the center gradually."

The common feature of all reforms was the policy of centralization. For the urban society, the reforms created a new political structure enthrusted with the performance of a variety of functions falling hitherto outside the sphere of goverment activity. Until that time, the necessary organization and investments to provide urban services were realized mainly by the statesmen but not directly by state organization. Every vakıf foundation had a measure of internal autonomy in its own influence area in terms of organization and activities. At the local level, the centralization meant the existence of a functional goverment in every town. Thus with the appointment of muaccelat nazırı, as the director of

---

[10] F. Köprülü, 'Vakıf Müessesesi', p. 23. and Mustafa Nuri Paşa, Netayic-ül Vukuat, C. IV

all vakıfs, to the provincial towns by the ministry of evkaf in 1835,[11] the centralization process of evkaf was reinforced. The fountain network which covered the regions of İstanbul, Üsküdar and Galata was assigned to the ministry of evkaf in 1836. Because of the deteriorating fiscal position of the state all the vakıfs of avariz-i mahalle were transferred to the central treasury in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Hence the transformation of the political system ceased the internal autonomy of the vakıf system. For all the centralization efforts at the local level and the formation of municipalities in towns, the pervasion and power of vakıfs continued along the Constitutional Period (1875-76, 1908-18). Although the official ideology of the central authority was against the existence of vakıf institutions, the dominance of the vakıf system in local affairs remained unchanged especially in small towns until the Republican Period (1923). After the establishment of the Republic, the functions of the Evkaf-i Hümayun Nezareti were distributed to the other ministries.[12]

- dervish lodges, medreses and schools were articulated with the ministry of public education,
- tımarhane and darüşşifa with the ministry of health and social aid,
- the allowance of orphons with the department of justice,
- some of the taxes with the ministry of finance,
- the system of water supply, fountains, cemeteries and the system of trolley with the municipalities.

The municipalities is the late Ottoman and in the early Republican cities were not integrated with the urban society. The provincial organizations financed by the state could handle the local 'social and economic affairs' but were not much associated with the urban people compared with the vakıf institutions. These newly established institutions planned and constructed the infrastructure of town so they could not involve in the daily practice and communal life of urban society. Contrary to the religious character of the former ones, secular municipalities

---

[11] N. Öztürk, 'Evkaf-ı Hümayun Nezaretinin Kuruluş Tarih ve Nazırların Hal Tercümeleri' Vakıflar Dergisi, 1982

[12] R. Ziyaoğlu, 'İstanbul Kadıları, Şehreminleri, Belediye Reisleri ve Partiler Tarihi', p. 125

lacked in this ideological character. Quarters were reduced to administrative units in spite of their lasting religious, ethnic and linguistic identity; these qualities could not be institutionalized within these urban based structures. The fact that municipalities increasingly dependend on the central sources to finance urban investments prevented them from becoming secondary institutions. As intermediate organizations between the state and urban society, municipalities had less internal autonomy than the vakıf institutions had had. In the Ottoman city, the pragmatic and flexible structure of vakıf institution had been a potential means of organization for the heterogeneous urban groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE VAKIFS

Aktepe, Münir. 1972. 'Manisa Ayanlarından Kara Osmanoğlu Mustafa Ağa ve
      Üç Vakfiyesi Hakkında Araştırma', Vakıflar Dergisi, IX: 361-400
      1973. 'Kara Osmanoğlu Hacı Osman Ağaya Ait İki Vakfiyesi',
      Vakıflar Dergisi, X: 161-175

Atay, Hüseyin. 1981. 'Fatih Süleymaniye Medreseleri Ders Programları ve
      İcazetnameler', Vakıflar Dergisi, XVI: 171-297

Ateş, İbrahim. 1981.'Vakıflarda Eğitim Hizmetleri ve Vakıf Öğrenci Yurtları',
      Vakıflar Dergisi, XIV: 85-101
      1982. 'Hayri ve Sosyal Hizmetler Açısından Vakıflar'. Vakıflar
      Dergisi, XV: 61-95

Baer, Gabriel. 1979. 'The Waqf as a Prop for the SOcial System'
      International Seminar on Social and Economic Aspects of Muslim
      Waqf, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
      1979. 'Hikr', Inter. Seminar on Social and Economic aspects of
      Muslim Waqf, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. 1942. 'Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak
      Vakıflar ve Temlikler', Vakıflar Dergisi, II: 279-387
      1963. 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İmaret Siteleri Kuruluş ve
      İşleyiş Tarzına Ait Araştırmalar', İst. Üni. İktisat Fak. Mecmuası,
      XXIII, 1-2: 239-296

Berki, Ali Himmet. 1966. Vakfa Dair Yazılan Eserlerle Vakfiye ve Benzeri
      Vesikalarda Geçen İslihat ve Tabirler!
      Ankara, Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü.
      1940. Vakıflar, İstanbul, Cihan Kütüphanesi.
      1950. Vakıflar, II. Kitap, Ankara.
      1958. 'İslamda Vakıf, Zeganus Paşa ve Zevcesi Nefise Hatun
         Vakfiyeleri', Vakıflar Dergisi, IV: 19-39
      1962. 'Hukuk ve İçtimai Bakımdan Vakıf', Vakıflar Dergisi, V: 9-15
      1962. 'Vakıf Kuran İlk Osmanlı Padişahı', Vakıflar Dergisi,
         V: 127-131

1968. 'Vakıflarda Şartlara Riayet Meselesi', Vakıflar Dergisi,
VII: 13-17

1968. 'Mustagn-En'Anh Vakıflar', Vakıflar Dergisi, VII: 17-19

1969. 'Vakıflar ve Vakıfların Maruz Kaldığı Tecavüz ve İhmaller',
Vakıflar Dergisi, VIII:

1973. '903 Sayılı Vakıflar Kanunu ve Nizamnamesine Göre Vakıflar',
Vakıflar Dergisi, X: 63-71

Berki, Şakir. 1957. 'İslam'da Vakıf', İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi,
Ankara Üniversitesi, 1-2.

1958-1959. 'İslam'da Vakıf, Sahih ve Gayri Sahih Nevileri',
İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, VII.

1965. 'Vakıfların Gördüğü Çeşitli Hizmetler', Vakıflar Dergisi,
VI: 85 93

1968. 'Vakıfların Devlete ve Devletin Vakıflara Hizmeti',
Vakıflar Dergisi, VII: 45-53.

1972. 'Türkiye'de İmparatorluk ve Cumhuriyet Devrinde Vakıf
Çeşitleri', Vakıflar Dergisi, IX: 1-13

1973. 'İmparatorluk ve Cumhuriyet Vakıf Hukukunda Vakıf Şartları',
Vakıflar Dergisi, 71-79

Cemal, Ekrem. 1935. Vakıflar, İstanbul, Mihran

Crecelius, Daniel. 1979. 'The Waqf of Muhammad Bey Abu al-Dhahab in
Historical Perspective', International Seminar on Social and
Economic Aspects of the Muslim Waqf, The Hebrew University of
Jerusalem.

Cunbur, Müjgan. 'Osmanlı Çağı Türk Vakıf Kütüphanelerinde Personel
Düzeninin Geliştirme Çabaları', VII Türk Tarih Kongresi 1973,
Ankara, TTK Yayınları 9. seri.

Ergin, Osman Nuri. 1936. Türkiye'de Şehirciliğin Tarihi İnkişafı,
İstanbul Üniversitesi, Hukuk Fakültesi.

1944. Türk İmar Tarihinde Vakıflar-Belediyeler-Patrikhaneler,
Sosyal İlimler Mecmuası Yayını.

Erzi, Adnan. 1942. 'Bursa'da İshaki Dervişlerine Mahsus Zaviyenin Vakfiyesi',
        Vakıflar Dergisi, II: 423-431

Faroqhi, Suraiya. 'Vakıf Administration in the Sixteenth Century Konya:
        The Zaviye of Sadreddin-i Kanevi', Journal of the Economic and
        Social History of the Orient XVII, 2'den ayrı basım, TTK Kütüphanesi.

Gilbar, Gad G. 1979. 'Muslim Waqf and Economic Growth Towards A Quantitative
        Analysis of Waqf, Investment and Productivity'
        1979. 'Muslim Waqf and Distribution of Capital and Income Towards
            A Quantitative Analysis', International Seminar on Social
            and Economic Aspects of Muslim Waqf, The Hebrew University
            of Jerusalem.

Gökbilgin, Tayyib. 1968. 'XVI. Asırda Karaman Eyaleti ve Larende Vakıf
        ve Müesseseleri', Vakıflar Dergisi, VII: 29-38

Gökçen, İbrahim. 1946. Manisa Tarihinde Vakıflar ve Hayırlar, Manisa Halkevi
        Yayını.

Güneri, Hasan. 1972. 'Vakıf Suları ve Su Vakıfları', Vakıflar Dergisi,
        IX: 67-81.
        1973. 'Azınlık Vakıfların İncelenmesi', Vakıflar Dergisi, X: 79-101

Hatemi, Hüseyin. 1969. Önceki ve Bugünkü Türk Hukukunda Vakıf Kurma
        Muamelesi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayını, 1434.

İlgürel, Mücteba. 1972. 'Sakız'da Türk Vakıfları', İ.Ü.E.F.
        Güneydoğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1; 7-12

İşeri, Ahmet. 1968. Türk Medeni Kanununa Göre Vakıf, Ankara.
        Ank. Üni. Hukuk Fakültesi Yayını, 238.

Kami, Mustafa. 1339. Evkaf Nedir?, İstanbul. Ank. Milli Kütüphane, 1946
        A-423.

Karinabadizade, Ömer Hilmi, 1978. Eski Vakıfların Temel Kitabı, İstanbul.
İst. Üni. Yayını, 2380, Hukuk Fakültesi Yayını, 537.

Kiel, Machiel. 1980. 'The Vakıfname of Rakkas Sinan Bey Karnobat and
the Ottoman Colonization of Bulgarian Thrace, (14-15th century),
The Journal of Ottoman Studies, I: 15-32. Enderun Kitabevi.

Köprülü, Bülent. 1951. Yeni ve Eski Hukukumuzda Vakfın Mahiyeti Mukaatali
ve İcareteynli Vakıfların Arzettiği Hususlar, İstanbul Üniversitesi,
Hukuk Fakültesi, Doçentlik Tezi.
1951. 'Tarihte Vakıflar', Ankara Üniversitesi, Hukuk Fakültesi
Dergisi, VIII, 3-4; 479.
1951. 'Evvelki Hukukumuzda Vakıf Nev'iyyetleri ve İcareteynli
Vakıflar', İst. Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası, 3-4

Köprülü, Fuad. 1942. 'Vakıf Müessesesinin Hukuki Mahiyeti ve Tarihi
Tekamülü', Vakıflar Dergisi, II: 1-37
1938. 'Vakıf Müessesesi ve Vakıf Vesikalarının Tarihi Ehemniyeti',
Vakıflar Dergisi, I: 1-7

Kunt, Metin. 1979. 'The Vakıf as Instrument of Public Policy; Notes on the
Köprülü Family Vakıfs', International Seminar on Social and
Economic Aspects of the Muslim Waqf, The Hebrew University of
Jerusalem.

Kunter, Halim Baki. 1939. Türk Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri, İstanbul.
Cumhuriyet Basımevi.

Kuran, Aptullah. 1972.'Orta Anadolu'da Klasik Osmanlı Mimarisi Çağının
Sonlarında Yapılan İki Külliye', Vakıflar Dergisi, IX: 239-251

_____. 'Üsküdar Atik Valide Külliyesinin Yerleşme Düzeni ve Yapım
Tarihi Üzerine'.

Layish, Aharon. 1979. 'The Family Waqf and the Shar'i Law of Success of
        Sharia Courts According to Waqfiyyat in the Sijill', International
        Seminar on the Social and Economic Aspects of the Muslim Waqf',
        The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Madran, Emre. 1972. 'Aydın, Nasuh Paşa Külliyesi'; Vakıflar Dergisi,
        IX: 183-191.

Mandaville, John E. 1979. 'Usurious Piety: THe Cash Waqf Controversy in
        the Ottoman Empire', International Journal of Middle East Studies,
        X, 3; 289-308.

Marcus, Abraham. 1979. 'Piety and Profit: The Waqf in the Society and
        Economy of the 18th century Aleppo', International Seminar on
        Social and Economic Aspects of the Muslim Waqf, The Hebrew
        University of Jerusalem.

Mardin, Ebülûla. 1924. Ahkam-i Evkaf, İstanbul.
        1939. İstanbul Vakıf Katma Suları, İstanbul, Cumhuriyet Basımevi
        1954. 'Vakıf Müessesesi', İktisat ve Ticaret Ansiklopedisi,
            X, 133. İstanbul. İRy → A E 75 146

Mc Chesney, R.D. 1979. 'Waqf and the Economy and Administration of the
        Shrine in the Late 19th century', Internatonal Seminar on Social
        and Economic Aspects of the Muslim Waqf, The Hebrew University of
        Jerusalem.

Öztürk, Nazif. 1982. 'Evkaf-i Hümayun Nezaretinin Kuruluş Tarihi ve
        Nazırların Hal Tercümeleri', Vakıflar Dergisi, XVI: 31-43
        1983. Vakıflar, Menşei ve Tarihi Gelişimi Açısından.
            Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayını.

Reyhanlı, Tülay. 1976. Osmanlı Külliye Mimarisinin Gelişmesi, İstanbul
        Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fak. Sanat Tarihi Bölümü, Basılmamış
        Doktora Tezi.

Roded, Ruth. 1979. 'The Waqf in Ottoman Aleppo'
        1979. 'Quantitative Analysis of Waqfiyya', International Seminar
            on Social and Economic Aspects of the Muslim Waqf,
            The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Unpublished papers.

Rogers, Michael. 1979. 'Central Asian Waqfiyyas of the fifteenth and
        sixteenth century, The Endowments of Khwaya Ahrar' International
        Seminar on the SOcial and Economic Aspects of the Waqf,
        The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Sahillioğlu, Halil. 1973. 'Ramazanoğullarından Davut Bey Oğlu Ali Bey Paşa
        Vakfiyesi', Vakıflar Dergisi, X: 136-160.

Selçuk, Furuzan. 1965. 'Vakıflar, Başlangıçtan 18. Yüzyıla Dek', Islamic
        Society and the West, Vakıflar Dergisi, VI: 21-31

Stillman, Normand. 1979. 'Waqf and the Ideology of Charity in Medival
        Islam', International Seminar on the Social and Economic Aspects
        of the Muslim Waqf, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem,
        Unpublished paper.

Uzunçarşılıoğlu, İ. 1932. Kütahya Şehri, İstanbul.
        1937. 'İbrahim Beyin Karaman İmareti Vakfiyesi', Belleten, I, 1
        1937. Anadolu Beylikleri, Ankara.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. 1971. 'Vakıf Sistemi ve Türk Şehirciliği'. Vakıflar
        Dergisi, IX: 39 67

Yediyıldız, Bahaeddin. 1980. 'Vakıf Müessesesinin XVIII. Asırda Kültür
        Üzerinde Etkileri', Türkiye'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi,
        (1071)-1920) Edit. by Osman Okyar and Halil İnalcık, Meteksan
        Lim. Şir. Ankara.
        1981. 'Vakıf Müessesesinin XVIII. Asır Türk Toplumundaki Rolü'
            Vakıflar Dergisi, XIV: 1-29

1984. 'Müessese-Toplum Münasebetleri Çerçevesinde XVIII. Asır
    Türk Toplumu ve Vakıf, <u>Vakıflar Dergisi</u>. XVIII: 5-43

1982. 'Türk Vakıf Kurucularının Sosyal Tabakalaşmadaki Yeri',
    <u>The Journal of Ottoman Studies</u>, III, İstanbul,
    Enderun Kitabevi.

THE TOWN OF İSTANBUL AND ITS VAKIFS IN THE YEARS 1453-1586

Aksoy, Özgönül. 1969. Osmanlı Devri İstanbul Şibyan Mektepleri Üzerine
        Bir İnceleme, İ.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi, Doktora tezi, 1967.
        İsmail Akgün Matbaası.

Aktepe, Münir. 1957. 'XVII. Asra Ait İstanbul Kazası Avarız Defteri',
        İstanbul Enstitüsü Dergisi, III.
        1958. 'XVIII. Asrın İlk Yarısında İstanbul'un Nüfus Meselesine
            Dair Bazı Vesikalar', İst. Üni. Edebiyat Fakültesi,
            Tarih Dergisi, IX, 13: 1-30

Ata, Galip. İstanbul Evkaf Suları Tarihçesi, 1922, Bahriye Matbaası.

Arel, A. 1975. Onsekizinci Yüzyıl İstanbul Mimarisinde Batılılaşma Süreci,
        İ.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi.

Aybet, Gülgün. 1980. XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıl Batı Seyyahlarına Göre Osmanlı
        İmparatorluğu Toplumsal Yapı ve Şehirleri, İ.Ü.E.F. Tarih Bölümü.,
        Basılmamış Doktora Tezi.

Ayverdi, Ekrem Hakkı. 1958. İstanbul Mahalleleri, Şehrin İskanı ve Nüfusu.
        Ankara, Vakıflar Umum Müdürlüğü Neşriyatı.
        1958. 19. Asırda Istanbul Haritası, İstanbul Fetih Derneği,
            İslam Enstitüsü Yayınları.
        1958. 'Fatih Devrinde İstanbul Mahalleleri', Vakıflar Dergisi.
            IV: 249-263.
        1953. Fatih Devri Mimarisi, İstanbul Matbaası, Istanbul Fethi
            Derneği Neşriyatı, 13.

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. 1962 1963. 'Fatih Cami ve İmareti Tesislerinin 1489-1490
        Yıllarına Ait Muhasebe Bilançoları', İstanbul Üni. İktisat
        Fakültesi Mecmuası, XXIII, 1-2: 249-341.
        1962. 'Ayasofya Cami ve Eyüp Türbesinin 1489-1490 Yıllarına Ait
            Muhasebe Bilançoları, İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, XXIII,
            1-2: 342-379.

1970. (ve E.H. Ayverdi) İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları.

1972. Süleymaniye Cami ve İmareti İnşaatı, Türk Tarih Kurumu, I, 10: VI. seri. Ankara.

1972. 'Süleymaniye Cami ve İmareti Tesislerine Ait Yıllık Muhasebe Bilançosu, 1585-1586', Vakıflar Dergisi, IX: 109-169

Baykal, Mürşide. 1952. Süleymaniye Külliyesi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tez, 2102.

Çetin, Atilla. 1981. 'İstanbul'daki Tekke, Zaviye ve Hankahlar Hakkında 1199 (1784) Tarihli Önemli Bir Vesika', Vakıflar Dergisi, XV: 583-591

Cevdet, Çulpan. 1970. İstanbul Süleymaniye Cami Kitabesi, Ankara. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Denel, Serim. 1982. Batılılaşma Sürecinde İstanbul'da Tasarım ve Dış Mekanlarda Değişim, ODTÜ, Mimarlık Fakültesi, Ankara.

Demirtekin, Feridun. 1958. 'Ecnebi Seyyahlara Göre XVIII. Asrın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul', İslam Enstitüsü Mecmuası, IV: 93-134.
1959. 'Ecnebi Seyyahlara Göre XVII. Yüzyılda İstanbul'un Medeni ve İçtimai Hayatı', İstanbul Enstitüsü Mecmuası', V: 59-89

Ergin, Osman Nuri. 1933. Cumhuriyet ve İstanbul Mahalli İdaresi, İstanbul Matbaacılık ve Neşriyat.
1934. İstanbul Şehir Rehberi, İstanbul Matbaacılık ve Neşriyat
1938. İstanbul'da İmar ve İskan Hareketleri, Eminönü Halkevi.
1939. Türk Şehirlerinde İmaret Sistemi, İstanbul, Cumhuriyet Basımevi.
1945. Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi, İstanbul Belediyesi.
1953. 'İstanbul'un Fethinden Sonra Şehir Nasıl İmar ve İskan Edildi', Resimli Tarih Mecmuası, 41: 2352-64
'İstanbul'da Türklerin Beş Asırlık İmar ve İskan Hareketleri', İstanbul Belediyesi Mecmuası, 14; 163-165.

Gürkan, Kazım İsmail. 1966. Süleymaniye Daruş'-şifası, İstanbul. 1967.
        Vakıf Gureba Hastanesi Tarihçesi, İstanbul, B.3

İnalcık, Halil. 'İstanbul', Enc. of Islam, New Edit, IV: 224-248.
        1979-1980. 'The Hub of the City: The Bedestan of İstanbul'
                International Journal of Turkish Studies, I: 1-17.

İnciciyan, P.G. 1976. XVIII. Asırda İstanbul, Çev. N.D. Andreasyan
        İstanbul Fetih Derneği.

Kılınçaslan, İsmet. 1981. İstanbul; Kentleşme Sürecinde Ekonomik ve
        Mekansal Yapı İlişkileri. İ.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi, Doçentlik Tezi.

Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. 1958. İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, İstanbul Ansiklopedisi ve
        Neşriyat Kollektif Şirketi. 7 cilt.

Kömürciyan, Eremya Çelebi. 1952. İstanbul Tarihi; XVII. Asırda İstanbul,
        Çev. H.D. Andreasyan, İst. Kurtuluş Basımevi.

Kuban, Doğan. 1968. 'An Ottoman Building Complex of the sixteenth century:
        The Sokullu Mosque and its Dependencies in İstanbul' Ars Orientalist,
        VII: 19-39
        1969. 'İstanbul'un Tarihi Yapısı, İstanbul Büyük Nazım Plan Bürosu
                (teksir).

Kumbaracılar, İzzet. 1938. İstanbul Sebilleri; Kültür Bakanlığı, Devlet
        Basımevi.

Kürkçüoğlu, Kemal Edip. 1962. Süleymaniye Vakfiyesi, Vakıflar Umum
        Müdürlüğü Neşriyatı, Ankara.

Kütükoğlu, Mübahat. 1976-1977. '1869'da Faal İstanbul Medreseleri'
        Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi, İst. Üni. Edebiyat Fakültesi, 7-8; 377

Nazım, Nirvan Saadi. 1341. Evkaftan Devrolunan Sular, İstanbul Şehremaneti.
        1946. İstanbul Suları, İstanbul, Halk Basımevi.

Orhonlu, Cengiz. 1966. 'Osmanlı Türkleri Devrinde İstanbul'da Kayıkçılık ve Kayık İşletmeciliği', İ.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi, XVI, 21; 109-134

    1972. 'Mesleki Bir Teşekkül Olarak Kaldırımcılık ve Osmanlı Şehir Yolları Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler', İ.Ü.E.F. Güneydoğu Avrupa Araştırma Dergisi, I: 91-138.

Ortaylı, İlber. 1977. 'İstanbul'un Mekansal Yapısının Tarihsel Evrimine Bir Bakış', Amme İdaresi Dergisi, Ankara, TODAIE, x, 2: haziran 1977.

Öz, Tahsin. 1953. 'Fatih Külliyesi, İlk Türk Üniversitesi', Resimli Tarih Mecmuası, 41: 230-236

    1953. '500 Sene Evvel İstanbul Nasıl İmar Edildi' Arkitekt, XXIII, 255, 258.

    1957. 'Süleymaniye İnşaasının 400'üncü Yıldönümü, Arkitekt, XXVII: 167-174.

    1963. 'İstanbul Fatih Külliyesi', Eretz-Israel c. 7 Mayer Memorial Volume, Israel Exploration Society, 1963'den ayrı basım Türk Tarih Kurumu Kütüphanesi.

    1965. İstanbul Camileri, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, Cilt, I-II

    1975. İstanbul Türbeleri, Atatürk Konferansları, 1971-1972, TTK Basımevi.

Altınay, Ahmed Refik. 1935. On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı. (1553-1591) İstanbul Devlet Basımevi

    1932. Hicri On Birinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1000-1100), (1592-1692) İstanbul Devlet Basımevi

    1932. Hicri On Üçüncü Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1200-1255), (1792-1847) İstanbul Matbaacılık ve Neşriyat

    1973. Türk Mimarları, Hilmi Kitabevi

Reyhanlı, Tülay. 1983. İngiliz Gezginlerine Göre İstanbul'da Hayat (1582-1599) Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.

Rosenthal, S. 1980. 'Foreigners and Municipal Reform in İstanbul', 1855-1856 International Journal of Middle East Studies, II: 227-245

Sahillioğlu, Halil. 1964. XVII. Asrın İlk Yarısında İstanbul'da Tedavüldeki
          Sikkelerin Raici', Belgeler, I, 1, 227-239.
          1967. 'Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1525 Yılı Sonunda İstanbul'da
                Fiatlar', Belgelerle Türk Tarih Dergisi, I, 1; 36-40; 1-2
                54-56, 1-3; 50-53.

Schneider, A.B. 1952. 'XVI. Yüzyılda İstanbul Nüfusu', Belleten, XVI,
          61; 1-39.

Stewig, R. 1965. İstanbul'un Bünyesi, İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayını.
          1965. Bizans, Konstantinopolis, İstanbul, Çev. R. Turfan-S. Yazman,
                İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayını.
          1966. İstanbul'da Çıkmaz Sokaklar, İstanbul, Baha Matbaası.

Tanışık, İbrahim Hilmi, 1943. İstanbul Çeşmeleri, T.C. Maarif Vekilliği,
          Antikite ve Müzeler Müdürlüğü Yayını.

Tekin, Şinasi. 1968. '1729 Yılında Vakfedilmiş Bir İstanbul Medresesinin
          Öğretim ve İdare Kadrosu Hakkında', Türk Kültürü, 17.

Tekindağ, Şehabettin. 1961. 'Ayasofya Tahrir Defterine Göre İstanbul',
          VI. Türk Tarih Kongresi.
          'İslam Ansiklopedisi' İstanbul Maddesi, Şehrin İmar ve İskanı
          1205-1214.

Tokay, Enver. 1951. İstanbul Şadırvanları, İ.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi,
          İstanbul.

Topuzlu, Cemil. 1939. Eski Şehremini C. Topuzlu'nun Başından Geçenler,
          Yazan, Sabih Alaçam, İstanbul, Milli Mecmua Basımevi.
          1944. 32 Sene Evvel Bugünki.Yarınki İstanbul, Beyoğlu Halkevi.
          1951. 80 Yıllık Hatıralarım, 1912-1919 İstanbul.

Ülgen, Saim. 1969. Fatih Devrinde İstanbul, Ankara, Vakıflar Umum
          Müdürlüğü Neşriyatı.

Ünver, Süheyl. 1938, 'Fatih Külliyesine Ait Diğer Mühim Bir Vakfiye',
        Vakıflar Dergisi, I: 39-46.
        1942. 'Süleymaniye Külliyesinde Darüşşifa, Tıp Medresesi ve
            Darülakakire Dair', Vakıflar Dergisi, II: 196-209.
        1945. Fatih'in Oğlu Beyazıd'ın Su Yolu Haritası Dolayısıyla 140
            Sene Önceki İstanbul, Belediye Matbaası, İstanbul.
        1946. Fatih Külliyesi ve Zamanı İlim Hayatı, İstanbul Üniversitesi
            Yayınları, 278.
        1953. Fatih Aşevi Tevzi'namesi, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu.
            Vakıflar Umum Müd. 1938. Fatih Mehmed II Vakfiyeleri, Türk
            Vakfiyeleri, 1. Ankara.

Ziyaoğlu, Rakım. 1971. İstanbul Kadıları-Şehreminleri-Belediye Reisleri ve
        Partiler Tarihi 1453-1971, İstanbul, İsmail Akgün Matbaası.
        1976. Hızır Bey Çelebi 1453-1458, İlk İstanbul Kadısı ve Belediye
            Başkanı. Türk Turing Otomobil Kurumu.

THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF OTTOMAN EMPİRE

Acar, Erhan. 1975. Ankara: Osmanlı-Anadolu Kentinde Mülkiyet-Doku İlişkileri
        ODTÜ, Mimarlık Fakültesi, tez.

Akdağ, Mustafa. 1965. 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Yükseliş Devrinde Esas Düzen',
        Ankara Üni. DTCF Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi, III, 4-5; 139-156.
        1971. Türkiye'nin İktisadi ve İçtimai Tarihi, Ankara, Cem Yayınevi.

Akşin, Sina. 1977. 'Osmanlı-Türk Toplumundaki Sınıf Yapısı Üzerine Bir
        Deneme, Toplum ve Bilim, 2.

Aktüre, Sevgi. 1975. 19. Yüzyıl Sonunda Anadolu Kenti Mekansal Yapı
        Çözümlemesi, ODTÜ, Mimarlık Fakültesi, Doktora tezi.

Aslanoğlu, İnci. 1967. 'The Karacabey İmaret, Ankara', Environmental Design,
        ODTÜ, Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayını, 7.

Baer, Gabriel. 1970. 'Administrative, Economic and Social Functions of
        Turkish Guilds', International Journal of Middle East Studies,
        I: 28-50.
        1970. 'Monopolies and Restrictive Practices of Turkish Guilds',
              Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient,
              XIII: 145-165.
        1970. 'Guilds in the Middle Eastern History' in M.A. Cook (ed)
              Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East, London,
              pp. 11-30
        1980. 'Ottoman Guilds: Areassesment', Türkiye'nin Ekonomik ve
              Sosyal Tarihi (1071-1920), Edit. by O. Okyar and H. İnalcık,
              Meteksan Lim. Şir. Ankara.

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. 1941 1942. 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Toprak Vakıflarının
        İdari-Mali Muhtariyeti Meselesi', Türk Hukuk Tarihi Dergisi,
        I. Ankara.
        1939. 'Malikane-Divanı Sistemi', Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi
              Mecmuası, II.

1939, 'Rumeli'de Kulluklar ve Ortakçı Kullar', İst. Üni.
İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, I, 3.

1940 1941. 'Türkiye'de İmparatorluk Devirlerinin Büyük Nüfus ve
Arazi Tahrirleri ile Hakana Mahsus İstatistik Defterleri',
İst. Üni. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, II, 1-2: 20-29,
214-247

1940. 'Türk Toprak Hukuku Tarihinde Tanzimat ve 1858 Tarihli Arazi
Kanunnamesi', İstanbul.

1940. İslam Türk Mülkiyet Hukuk Tatbikatının Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda
Aldığı Şekiller, İst. Üni. Hukuk Fakültesi Yayını.

1940. Şer'i Miras Hukuku ve Evlatlık Vakıfları, İstanbul.

1941. 'İslam-Türk Mülkiyet Hukuku', İst. Üni. Hukuk Fakültesi
Mecmuası, VII, 1.

1952. 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu
Olarak Sürgünler', İst. Üni. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası,
XI: 544-561.

1954. '933-934 (1527-1528) Tarihli Bir Osmanlı Bütçesi', İst. Üni.
İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, XV, 1-4.

1956. 'Türkiye'de Servaj Var mı İdi?', Belleten, 78.

1955 1956. 'Türk Yapı Malzemesi için Kaynaklar', İst. Üni.
İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, XVII.

1955-1956. 'Osmanlı Bütçelerine Dair Notlar', 193-224.
'1079-1080 (1691-1700) Mali Yılına Ait Bir Osmanlı Bütçesi
ve Ekleri', 225-302.
'1070-1071 (1660-1661) Tarihli Osmanlı Bütçesi ve Ekleri',
İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, XVII, 1-4, 304-347.

1957-1958. '954-955 (1547-1548) Yılına Ait Bir Osmanlı Bütçesi',
219-277.
'974 975 (1567-1568) Mali Yılına Ait Bir Osmanlı Bütçesi',
İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, XIX, 1-4; 277-332.

1963. 'XVI. ve XVII. Asırlarda Türkiye'de İnşaat İşçilerinin
Hukuki Statüsü', Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları, İstanbul.

1964. '894 (1488-1489) Yılı Cizyesinin Tahsilatına Ait Muhasebe
Bilançoları', Belgeler, I, 1. Ankara 2, 2/1, 2/2 sayılı
kayıtlar

1964. 'Edirne ve Civarındaki Bazı İmaret Tesisleri' Belgeler, I, 2: 235-277

Çadırcı, M. 1970. 'Türkiye'de Muhtarlık Teşkilatının Kurulması Üzerine Bir İnceleme', Belleten, XXXIV, 135; 409-420.
1972. 'Tanzimata Girerken Türkiye'de Şehir İdaresi', Ankara Üniversitesi DTCF, Doktora tezi.

Cezar, Mustafa. 1977. Anadolu Öncesi Türklerde Şehir ve Mimarlık, Türkiye İş Bankası, Kültür Yayınları, 176. Istanbul.
1983. Typical Commercial Buildings of the Ottoman Classical Period and the Ottoman Construction System, Türkiye İş Bankası, Kültür Yayınları, Istanbul.

Cin, Halil. 1969. Miri Arazi ve Bu Arazinin Mülk Haline Dönüşümü, Ankara Üniversitesi, Hukuk Fakültesi Yayınları.
1978. Osmanlı Toprak Düzeni ve Bu Düzenin Bozulması, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 295/3. Ankara.

Doğan, A.I. 1977. Osmanlı Mimarisinde Tarikat Yapıları: Tekkeler, Zaviyeler, ve Benzer Nitelikteki Futuvvet Yapıları, İstanbul, İ.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi, Basılmamış doktora tezi.

Eichel, Marijean H. 1975. 'Ottoman Urbanism in the Balkans: A Tentative View', The East Geographer, 10: 45-54.

Erder, Leili. 1974. 'Patterns of Population Changes in Nineteenth Century Anatolia', Princeton University Conference in the Social and Economic History at the Near East, Conference paper, June 1974.
1975. 'The Measurement of Pre-Industrial Population Changes: The Ottoman Emoire from the 15th to the 17th century'. Middle Eastern Studies, XI, 3: 284-301.
1978. 'Tarihsel Bakış Açısından Türkiye'nin Demografik ve Mekansal Yapısı', İlhan Tekeli-Leili Erder, Yerleşme Yapısında Uyum Süreci Olarak İç Göç, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Nüfus Etüdleri Merkezi, Ankara.

Ergenç, Özer, 1973, '1580-1596 Yılları Arasında Ankara ve Konya Şehirlerinin
    Mukayeseli İncelemesi Yoluyla Osmanlı Şehrinin Kurumları ve
    Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapısı Üzerine Bir Deneme', Ankara Üniversitesi,
    DTCF, Doktora tezi.
    1980. 'XVIII. Yüzyıl Başlarında Ankara'nın Yerleşim Durumu
        Üzerine Bazı Bilgiler', Osmanlı Araştırmaları, The Journal
        of Ottoman Studies, I, 85-105. İstanbul, Enderun Kitabevi.
    1980. 'Osmanlı Şehrinde Esnaf Örgütlerinin Fiziki Yapıya Etkileri'
        Social and Economic History of Turkey, Edit. by O. Okyar
        and H. İnalcık Ankara, Meteksan Lim. Şir.
    1981. 'Osmanlı Şehirlerindeki Yönetim Kurumlarının Niteliği
        Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler', VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara
        1265-1274.
    1982. 'Osmanlı Klasik Dönemindeki Eşraf ve Ayan Üzerine Bazı
        Bilgiler', The Journal of Ottoman Studies, III, 105-118.

Ergin, Osman Nuri. 1941, Türkiye Maarif Tarihi I-II. cilt I-III, B-2,
    Istanbul, 1977.

Eyice, Semavi. 1962-1963. 'İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini ve İçtimai Bir
    Müessesesi: Zaviyeler ve Zaviyeli Camiler; İst. Üni. İktisat
    Fakültesi Mecmuası, XXIII, 1-2; 1-80.

Faroqhi, Suraiya, 1973. 'Social Mobility among the Ottoman Ulema in the
    Late Sixteenth Century', International Journal of Middle East,
    IV, 2: 204-218.
    1979. 'The Development of the Anatolian Urban Network During the
        Sixteenth Century', (and L. Erder) Journal of the Economic
        and Social History of the Orient, XXII, III.
    1979-1980. 'Taxation and Urban Activities in Sixteenth Century
        Anatolia', International Journal of Turkish Studies, I,
        1: 19-53.
    1980. 'Land Transfer, Land Disputes and Askeri Holdings (1592-1600)',
        Memorial Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Ed. Robert Mantran, Bibliotheque
        de l'Institut Francis d'Eudes Anatoliennes d'Istanbul,
        XXVIII: 87-99. Paris

1981. 'Urban Development in Ottoman Anatolia 16-17. centuries' METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture, XVII, 1.

1984. Towns and Townsmen in Ottoman Anatolia 1520-1650, Cambridge University Press.

Garnett, L.M.J. 1909. Turkish Life in Town and Country, London, Methuen.

Gerber, Haim. 1976. The Anatolien City of Bursa in the Seventeenth Century: Economy and Society, Unpublished Ph. D. Theses, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

1976. 'Guilds in Seventeenth Century Anatolien Bursa', Asian and African Studies, XI: 59-86.

Goodwin, G. 1971. A History of Ottoman Architecture, London, Thames and Hudson.

Gökbilgin, Tayyip. 1952. XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livası: Vakıflar, Mülkler ve Mukataalar, Edebiyat Fakültesi Neşriyatı, İstanbul.

1950-1955. 'XVI. Asrın Başlarında Kayseri Şehri ve Livası', Zeki Velidi Togan'a Armağan, İstanbul, 93-108.

1962. 'XVI. Yüzyıl Başlarında Trabzon Livası ve Doğu Karadeniz Bölgesi', Belleten, 102.

İnalcık, Halil. 1958. 'Osmanlı Hukukuna Giriş', Ankara Üni. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, 1: 102-126.

1959. 'İslam Arazi ve Vergi Sisteminin Teşekkülü', İslam Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1.

1964. 'The Nature of Traditional Society, Turkey', Edit. by R. Ward and D. Rustow, Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey, Princeton.

1969. 'Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire', Journal of Economic History, XXIX. pp. 97-140.

1968. 'Yükseliş Devri Osmanlı Ekonomisine Umumi Bakış', Türk Kültürü Dergisi, 68.

1970. 'The Foundation of the Ottoman Economic-Social System in
    Cities', Studia Balcanica, Sofia: III. La Ville Balkanique
    XVe-XIXe, 1970.
    'The Policy of Mehmed II toward the Greek Population of
    İstanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City', Dumborton
    Oaks Papers, 23: 213-249.
1973. The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600, Trans.
    by N. Itzkowitz and C. Imber Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd.
1977. 'Centralization and Decentralization in Ottoman Administration',
    Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History, Carbondale,
    II: 27-52.

Itzkowitz, N. 1962. 'Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities', Studia Islamica,
    XVI: 73-95.
    1972. Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition, New York, Random House.

Jennings, Ronald. 1972. The Judicial Registers (seri mahkeme sicilleri)
    of Kayseri (1590-1630) as a source of Ottoman History, Ph. D.
    dissertation, UCLA.

Kara, Mustafa. 1977. Tekkeler ve Zaviyeler, (Din, Hayat, Sanat Açısından)
    İstanbul, Dergah Yayınları.

Karpat, Kemal. 1975. 'The Background of Ottoman Concept of City and Urbanity',
    in Structures Sociates et Développement Cultures des Villes
    Sud-Est Europeéenes et Adriatiques, 323-340 Bucharest.
    1977. 'The SOcial and Economic Transformation of İstanbul in the
    Nineteenth Century', Istanbul a la Janction des Cultures
    Balkanique, Mediterraneennes, Slave et Oriental, aux XVIe-
    XIXe, Bucarest, AIESEE, 1977: 395-436.

Koçi Bey, Mustafa. Koçi Bey Risalesi, 1939, nes. Ali Kemali Aksut. 1972.
    MEB Devlet Kitabları, İstanbul Sad. Zuhuri Danışman.

Köprülü, Fuad. 1981. Bizans Müesseselerinin Osmanlı Müesseselerine Tesiri,
    Ötüken Neşriyat, İstanbul.
    Orijinali: Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası, I, 1931.

Kuban, Doğan, 1961, 'Türk Şehir Yapısı Üstüne', Mimarlık ve Sanat, 1: 17-41

       1968. 'Anadolu Türk Şehri Tarihi Gelişmesi, Sosyal ve Fiziki
          Özellikleri Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler', Vakıflar Dergisi, VII:
          53-73.

       1982. Türk ve İslam Sanatı Üzerine Denemeler, Arkeoloji ve Sanat
          Yayınları.

Kunt, I. Metin. 1978. Sancaktan Eyalete, 1550-1650 Arasında Osmanlı Ümerası
       ve İl İdaresi, Boğaziçi Üni. Yayınları, no 154. Temel Bilimler
       Fakültesi, Beşeri Bilimler Bölümü.

Kuran, Aptullah, 1968. The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture,
       Chicago and London.

Levey, Michael. 1975. The World of Ottoman Art, Thames and Hudson London.

Lowry, Heat W. 1977. The Ottoman Tahrir Defters As a Source for Urban
       Demographic History: The Case Study of Trabzon, (1486-1583)
       University of California, Los Angeles, Dissertation.

Jon E. Mandaville, 1979. 'Usurious Piety: The Cash Waqf Controversy in the
       Ottoman Empire' Int. Journal Middle East Studies 10, 289-308.

Mardin, Şerif. 1974. 'Super Westernization in Urban Life in the Ottoman
       Empire in the Last Quarter of the Nineteenth Century' in Peter
       Benedict et. al eds. Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives,
       Leiden, 43-46.

Mustafa Nuri Paşa, 'Netayic-ül.Vukuat', Kurumları ve Örgütleriyle Osmanlı
       Tarihi. Sadeleştiren: Prof. Dr. Neşet Çağatay
       Cilt I, II, Ankara 1979 Türk Tarih Kurumu
       Cilt III, IV, Ankara 1980 Türk Tarih Kurumu

Orhonlu, Cengiz. 1963. Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Aşiretlerin İskan Teşebbüsü,
       İst. Üni. Edebiyat Fakültesi, İstanbul.
       1967. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Derbend Teşkilatı, İst. Üni.
       Edebiyat Fakültesi, İstanbul.

1969. 'The Institution of "Şuyolcu" in the 16th Century'.
  Actes du Premier Congres International de Etudes Balkaniques
  et Sud-Est Europeennes III, Sofia, 1969.
1980. 'Şehir Mimarları', The Journal of Ottoman Studies, II,
  1 30. Enderun Kitabevi

Ortaylı, İlber. 1973. 'Bazı Alman Seyahatnamelerindeki 16. Yüzyıl Türkiye
  Şehir ve Köylerine Ait Bilgiler', A.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi
  Dergisi, XVII, 4.
  1974. Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-1878), Ank.
    TODAIE, Sevinç Matbaası.
  1974. 'Eski Türk Şehirlerinde Yapı İşlerinin Fonksiyonel Düzenlenişi
    ve Yapı Örgütü', Mimarlık, 7: 11-16.
  1976. 'Tarihsel Evrimi İçinde Mimarlar', Mimarlık, 3, 14
  1976. 'Osmanlı Kadısının Taşra Yönetimindeki Rolü Üzerine',
    Amme İdaresi Dergisi, IX, 1.
  1978. İ. Tekeli, Türkiye'de Belediyeciliğin Evrimi, Türk İdareciler
    Derneği.
  1979. Türkiye İdare Tarihi, Ankara, TODAIE, Doğan Basımevi.

Öz, Tahsin. 1941. 'Murad I ile Emir Süleymana Ait İki Vakfiye', Tarih
  Vesikaları, I, 4; 214-244.

Selen, H.S. 1948. '16. ve 17. Yüzyıllarda Anadolu'nun Köy ve Küçük Şehir
  Hayatı', III. Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, TTK Yayını, Seri 9, no 3.

Şener, Şami. 1979. 'Netayic-ül Vukuat Işığında Osmanlı Hükümet Yapısındaki
  Değişme! Kuruluştan TAnzimata Kadar, İst. Üni. Edebiyat Fakültesi
  Sosyoloji Bölümü, Doktora tezi.

Tankut, Gönül. 1973. 'Osmanlı Şehrinde Ticari Fonksiyonların Mekansal
  Dağılımı', VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, TTK Yayını, 9. seri
  7/2 sayı.

Tekeli, İlhan, 1970, 'The Evolution of Spatial Organization in the Ottoman Empire', Ankara, Teksir, 21. Orta Doğu Konferansına sunulan bildiri.

    1972. 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Şehrin Kurumlaşmış Dış İlişkileri' Bülten, O.D.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi, Araştırma ve Geliştirme Enstitüsü, I, 2.

    1972. 'On Istitutionalized External Relations of Cities on the Ottoman Empire a Settlement Models Approach', Etudes Balkaniques, VII, 2: 46-72.

    1980. 'Anadolu'daki Kentsel Yaşantının Örgütlenmesinde Değişik Aşamalar', Toplum ve Bilim, Bahar-Yaz, 1980, 9-10

Tongur, H. 1939. 'Türk Şehirlerinde Çarşılar ve Kapanlar', Belediyeler Dergisi, V, 52:

    1940. 'Türk Şehirlerinde Bedestenler ve Hanlar', Belediyeler Dergisi, V, 58

    1940. 'Türk Şehirlerinde Pazar ve Panayırlar', Belediyeler Dergisi, V, 54

Tözeren, N. 1952. 'Türkiye'de Ecnebilerin Mülk Edinmeleri', IV. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, TTK Basımevi.

Turan, Şerafettin, 1961. 'XVII Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun İdari Taksimatı', Atatürk Üniversitesi Yıllığı, 201-232.

    1963. 'Osmanlı Teşkilatında Hassa Mimarları, Ank. Üni. DTCF Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi, I, 1.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, 1965. Osmanlı Devletinde İlmiye Teşkilatı, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

    1975. Osmanlı Tarihi, Cilt III, b-2. Ankara

Ülker, Necmi. 1974. The Rise of İzmir, 1688-1740, Ph. D. Diss. University of Michigan.

Vogt-Göknil, 1966. Living Architecture: Ottoman, Grossel and Dunlap, New York.

Yavuz, Erdal - Uğurer, U. (der.) 'Tarih İçinde Ankara', Eylül 1981
        Seminer Bildirileri, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara, 1984.

Yücel, Yaşar. 1974. 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Desentralizasyona Dair
        Genel Gözlemler', Belleten, XXXVIII, 152, Ekim, 1974, 657-708.

THE ISLAMIC CITY

Benet, M. 1963. 'The Ideology of Islamic Urbanization', International
    Journal of Comparative Sociology 4: 211-226.

G.H. Blake and R.I. Lawless. 1980. 'The Changing Middle Eastern City',
    Croom Helm London Barnes and Noble Books. New York.

Bonnie, M.E. 1976. 'A General Bibliography for an Islamic City',
    Middle Eastern Studies Association Bulletin, X, 3: 1-37.

Brown, L. Carl. 1973. From Madina to Metropolis, Heritage and Change in
    the Near Eastern. Princeton, New Jersey,
        I. Lapidus: 'Traditional Muslim Cities: Structure and Change.
        İ. Tekeli : 'Evolution of Spatial Organization in Ottoman Empire
                and Turkish Republic
        R. Ettinghausen: 'Muslim Cities: Old and New.

F. Eickelman, Dale. 1974. 'Is there an Islamic City? The Making a quarter
    on a Morocean Town', International Journal of Middle East
    Studies, 5: 274 294.

Gibb, H.A.R. and Bowen Harold. 1957. Islamic Society and The West,
    A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Muslim Culture
    in the Near East. Volume I-II, Oxford University Press

Grunebaum, G. Evan. 1961. Islam, Essays in the Nature and Growth of a
    Cultural Tradition, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. London

Hassan, R. 1971. 'The Nature of Islamic Urbanization: a historical
    perspective', Ekistics, XXXI, 182
    1972. 'Islam and Urbanization in the Medieval Middle East',
        Ekistics, XXXIII, 195.

Hourani, A.H. and Stern, S.M. 1970. The Islamic City, A Colloquium-Papers
    on Islamic History. The Near Eastern History Group Oxford and
    the Near Eastern Center University of Pensilvania Bruno Cassier
    (Publishers) Ltd. Oxford.

Ismail, A. 1972, 'Origin, Ideology and Physical Pattern of Arab
        Urbanization', Ekistics, XXXIII, 195,

Lapidus, Ira Marvin, 1967. Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages, Harvard
        University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts,
        1969. 'Muslim Cities and Islamic Societies', Middle Eastern City,
            (ed.) California: University of California Press.

Lebon, J.H.G. 1971. 'The Islamic City in the Near East', Ekistics, XXXI, 182.

Michell, George. 1978. Architecture of the Islamic World', Its History and
        Social Meaning, William Morrow and Company Inc. New York.

Serjeant, R.B. 1980. The Islamic City, Selected papers from the colloqium
        held at the Middle East Centre, Faculty of Oriental Studies,
        Cambridge, United Kingdom, from 19 to 23 July, 1979.

Weber, Max. 1958. The City, trans. and   ed. by Don Martindale and Gertrud
        Neuwirth Heinemann, London.